







THE  
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW

-

EDINBURGH  
PRINTED BY J. CONSTABLE PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY

THE  
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

MAY—AUGUST 1856.

VOL. XXV.

EDINBURGH :  
W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET.  
LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

MDCCLVI.



## CONTENTS OF No. I.

---

ART.	Page
I.—1. The General Treaty, and three Conventions of Paris. 1856.	
2. Letters upon Turkey. By M. Ubicini. Translated by Lady Easthope. London, 1856.	
3. History of the Ottoman Turks. By E. S. Creasy, Professor of Modern History in the University of London. 2 vols. London, 1854-56.	
4. The Trans-Caucasian Campaign of the Turkish Army. By Laurence Oliphant. Edinburgh, 1856,	281
II.—1. History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen since the Reformation. By the Rev. W. Brown, M.D. Third Edition, 1854. Edinburgh and London, W. Blackwood.	
2. Cyclopædia of Missions. By the Rev. H. Newcomb. 1856. New York, C. Scribner.	
3. Missions to the Heathen. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.	
4. Church in the Colonies. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.	
5. Colonial Church Chronicle.	
6. Periodical Accounts of the Moravian Missions; Annales de la Propagation de la Foi; Reports of various Societies,	314
III.—1. Madame de Longueville. Par M. Cousin.	
2. Étude sur les Femmes Illustres du XVII <sup>me</sup> Siècle. Par M. Cousin.	
3. Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien. Par M. Cousin.	
4. Madame de Hautefort. Par M. Cousin.	
5. Jacqueline Pascal. Par M. Cousin,	349
IV.—The Rise of the Dutch Republic: A History. By John Lothrop Motley. Three Volumes, 8vo. London, 1856,	376

Art.	Page
V.—Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers. Second Edition. London, Moxon, 1856, . . .	399
VI.—1. <i>Microgeologie, das Erden und Felsen schaffende Wirken, des unsichtbar kleinen selbständigen Lebens auf der Erde.</i> Von Christian Gottfried Ehrenberg. With Forty Folio Plates. 1 vol. fol. Leipzig, 1854. Pp. 500.	
2. <i>The Micrographic Dictionary, a Guide to the Examination and Investigation of Microscopic Objects.</i> By J. W. Griffith, M.D., and Arthur Henfrey, F.R.S. Illustrated by 41 Plates and 816 Woodcuts. 8vo. Lond. 1856. Pp. 816.	
3. <i>The Microscope and its Revelations.</i> By William R. Carpenter, M.D., F.R.S. Illustrated with 315 Wood Engravings. Lond. 1856. Pp. 778.	
4. <i>The Microscope.</i> By Dionysius Lardner, D.C.L. From the Museum of Science and Art. With 117 Engravings. Lond. 1856.	
5. <i>A Practical Treatise for the Use of the Microscope, including the different Methods of Preparing and Examining Animal, Vegetable, and Mineral Structures.</i> By John Quekett. Illustrated with Nine Plates, and 211 Woodcut Engravings. Lond. 1818. Pp. 451.	
6. <i>The Microscopic Cabinet of Select Animated Objects, with a Description of the Jewel and Doublet Microscope, Test Objects, &amp;c.</i> With Thirteen Coloured Plates and numerous Engravings on Wood. By Andrew Pritchard. Lond. 1832. Pp. 246.	
7. <i>The Natural History of Animalcules, with Instructions for Procuring and Viewing them.</i> Illustrated by upwards of 300 magnified figures on steel. By Andrew Pritchard, Esq. Lond. 1836. Pp. 196.	
8. <i>Micrographia, containing Practical Essays on Reflecting, Solar, Oxyhydrogen Gas Microscopes, Micro-meters, Eye-pieces, &amp;c.</i> By C. R. Goring, M.D., and Andrew Pritchard, Esq., M.R.I. Lond. 1837. Pp. 231.	
9. <i>Microscopic Illustrations of Living Objects, with Researches concerning the Methods of Constructing Microscopes, and Instructions for Using them.</i> With Coloured Engravings and Woodcuts. Third Edition. By Andrew Pritchard, Esq., M.R.I., &c. Lond. 1845. Pp. 296.	
10. <i>A History of Infusorial Animalcules, Living and Fossil.</i> With 24 Plates. By Andrew Pritchard, M.R.I. New edit. Lond. 1852. Pp. 720.	
11. <i>Lectures on Histology.</i> By John Quekett. With 519 Woodcuts. Lond. 1852. Pp. 216, . . .	437

ART.	Page
VII.—Memoirs of Frederick Perthes ; or, Literary, Religious, and Political Life in Germany, from 1789 to 1843. From the German of Clement Theodore Perthes, Professor of Law in the University of Bonn. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, Thomas Constable & Co, 1856, . . . . .	477
VIII.—1. Lettres du Maréchal St. Arnaud. 2 vols. Paris, 1855.	
2. L'Expédition de Crimée jusqu'à la Prise de Sebastopol. Chroniques de la Guerre d'Orient. Par le Baron de Bazancourt, Chargé de Mission en Crimée, par S. Exc. le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique. 2 Vols. 3me édition. Paris, 1856.	
3. Opening Address of Major-General Sir Richard Airey, K.C.B., Quartermaster-General of the Forces, before the Board of General Officers assembled at the Royal Hospital, Chelsea ; together with his Summing up Address, &c. &c. 1 Vol. 8vo. London, 1856, . . . . .	493
IX.—1. Papers relating to Oude. (Printed by Order of Parliament.)	
2. The Private Life of an Eastern King. 2d Edition. London, 1856.	
3. Speech of W. S. Seton-Karr, Esq., at the Court of Proprietors of India Stock, May 14, 1856.	
4. Farewell Minute of Lord Dalhousie, . . . . .	515





THE

# NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

---

AUGUST, 1856.

---

- ART. I.—1. *The General Treaty, and three Conventions of Paris.* 1856.
2. *Letters upon Turkey.* By M. UBICINI. Translated by Lady Easthope. London, 1856.
3. *History of the Ottoman Turks.* By E. S. CREASY, Professor of Modern History in the University of London. 2 vols. London, 1854-56.
4. *The Trans-Caucasian Campaign of the Turkish Army.* By LAURENCE OLIPHANT. Edinburgh, 1856.

IT will here be our aim to consider the prospects which present themselves to the Ottoman Empire, at the close of a military contest and a diplomatic negotiation, which have constituted an era both in its external relations and in its political organization. In virtue of the stipulations originated or recorded in the Treaty of Paris, Turkey has received an internal constitution which has no parallel in its past government; and has been raised to an international position without example in the history of the last eighty years. The struggle sustained for the independence of Europe thus indirectly threatened in the East, has been immediately associated, not only with the discharge of ancient obligations to the Ottoman State, but with the interests of freedom and commerce, of Christianity and mental development, among the rising races of the Cross. That struggle was an event which had been gradually foreseen for the past forty years; and the nineteenth century has, in this respect, formed the exact counterpart of the seventeenth. For, as the Treaties of Westphalia (1648)—in endeavouring to adjust the equilibrium of Europe, which had been lost in the union of the Austrian, the Castilian, and the Burgundian power—assigned to France the germ of that

supremacy in the West, which she afterwards developed in the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659); so the Treaty of Vienna (1815)—in restoring the balance of power against the encroachments of the French empire—assigned to Russia the germ of that ascendancy in the East, which she afterwards developed in the Treaty of Adrianople (1829). The Peace of Paris (1856)—which has formed the ultimate reaction against the stipulations of Adrianople, as the Peace of Utrecht (1713) had formed the ultimate reaction against the stipulations of the Pyrenees—has vindicated the principles which had been asserted in either period of the seventeenth century;—and for that heroic struggle for the independence of Europe which her governments owed to the duumvirate, in the one age, of Richelieu and Gustavus Adolphus, and, in the other, of William of Orange and Leopold I., they are now indebted to the Administration of Lord Palmerston, and to the Emperor of the French.

In order to estimate the magnitude both of the immediate and prospective results of the Treaty of Paris in its relations with the Ottoman Empire, it will be necessary, in the first place, to take a rapid review of the course of military disaster and internal misgovernment which have followed the Treaty of Kainardji (1774). At so recent a period as that of the treaty in question, the military strength of Turkey was not unequal to that of Austria, and the dominance of the Moslem over the Christian population was secure as that of Muscovy over the external races of the Russian Empire. 1. The Peace of Kainardji initiated the system of territorial and political aggression by which Russia aimed during the eighty following years, (1774-1854,) simultaneously to contract the extent of the Turkish Empire, and to destroy the allegiance of its Christian subjects. By that treaty, the Crimea and the whole territory to the eastward of the Dniester—subject hitherto to the government or the suzerainty of Turkey—were erected into an independent Tartar State; and Russia obtained a right of mediation between the Porte and its Christian populations, tantamount to a qualified Protectorate. 2. By the declaration of 1783, the greater part of this Tartar state was incorporated with the Russian Empire. 3. Under the alliance of 1787 between Austria and Russia, war was made on Turkey in the following year, with a view to the total suppression of the Ottoman Empire, and to the partition of its territories jointly by those Powers. From this danger, indeed, Turkey was delivered, through the mediation of Great Britain and Prussia, under the Treaty of Sistova and the Treaty of Jassy (1791 and 1792.) 4. By the latter of these stipulations, the Russian dominion was extended to the line of the Dniester, which the Treaty of Kainardji had already fixed as the boundary of the Turkish sway. The alliance

of Great Britain and Prussia, in this juncture, alone withheld Russia from demanding and usurping the whole of the Trans-Danubian provinces of Turkey. By the same treaty, Russia gained similar advantages over the Asiatic, with those which she had already secured over the European Christians of Turkey. 5. Under the Treaty of Bucharest (1812), her frontier was extended from the Dniester to the Pruth; and the Czar once more demanded Wallachia and Moldavia in addition to the spoil which he thus secured in the accession of Bessarabia to his dominions. 6. The succeeding Treaty of Akkerman (1826), in addition to the cession, for which it stipulated, of important Asiatic fortresses to Russia, gave a regular organization to the interference of that State in the Principalities of the Danube, which threatened a disseverance of their relations with the Government of Constantinople. 7. The Treaties of St. Petersburg and London (1826 and 1827) initiated an interference in the affairs of Greece, which Turkish misgovernment had necessitated, and finally established the independence of the Greek peninsula, which (although inevitable in the attitude of the Porte) a policy of conciliation by that Government towards Greece might even then have averted. 8. Finally, the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), in surrendering to Russia the islands intervening between the Danubian mouths, choked the great artery of the Slavonian races of the south. Such was the territorial and political declension of the Ottoman Empire, during the fifty-five years intervening between the earlier campaigns of Catherine and the earlier campaigns of Nicholas.

During the quarter of a century which elapsed between the Treaty of Adrianople and the commencement of the recent war (1829-1854), the watchful policy of England effectually repressed the progress of the Russian dominion in the East. It also gave a vast extension to the Turkish commerce. The schemes developed by Russia in 1839 were defeated by the armed intervention of Great Britain in 1840; and the temporary stipulations of Hunkiar Skelessi (1833), by which the Straits of the Dardanelles were closed in the interest of Russia, were replaced by the permanent Treaty of the 13th of July 1841—the last diplomatic act of the Melbourne Administration. But the past stipulations, extending from the Peace of Kainardji to the Peace of Adrianople, continued necessarily to work their influence on the Ottoman Empire: a policy of peace, though directly designed to countervail the aggressive policy of Russia, could only proceed upon a recognition of antecedent facts.

Thus, therefore, in 1854, the aggression of the Court of St. Petersburg, after the lapse of eighty years, began to press upon six cardinal elements of the Turkish system with intolerable force.

1. In virtue of successive treaties, of the whole European seaboard of the Euxine, stretching from the Cimmerian to the Thracian Bosphorus, one-half had been alienated from Turkey, and been annexed to Russia. 2. The gradual infraction of the political, proportionately with that of the territorial, integrity of the Empire, had practically subordinated, in its Christian Principalities, the authority of the Sultan to the authority of the Czar. 3. The prosecution of the same policy in the Caucasian provinces of Asia, after morally alienating their population from the Porte, actually alienated the territories which they inhabited. 4. The vast elements of commerce displayed by Turkey in the possession of the Lower Danube had been neutralized, and the Russian Government had nearly monopolized the trade of the Euxine. 5. The insidious policy of the same Power, by fomenting the influence of internal misgovernment, dis severed the Greek peninsula from Turkey. 6. The naval armaments to which these aggressions had given birth, established the maritime supremacy of Russia in the Black Sea, which supplied the means for an immediate extinction of the Government at Constantinople.

The Treaty of Paris, therefore, in representing the successful opposition of Western Europe to the traditionary aggression of Russia, constitutes the basis of the whole prospective system of the East. The double aim of that Treaty rests in the consolidation of the Turkish Empire, against the arm at once of external violence and of internal revolution. In the terms of this negotiation we include the civil concessions of the Porte towards its Christian subjects; for those concessions were dictated by the direct solicitation of the Western Powers, rather than by the spontaneous liberality of the State.\* The course of policy by which the interests of Eastern Europe were to be secured, clearly rested,—first, in a dissociation of the Christian populations of Turkey from the surrounding states, into whose despotism they would otherwise, either actually or morally, be absorbed; and secondly, in the establishment of a reciprocity of interest between the dominant and the subject population. By these means the Ottoman Empire gained the two essential conditions of future independence, arising respectively from territorial integrity and from internal cohesion. This twofold basis of the future organisation of Turkey presupposed, of course, the destruction of the maritime supremacy of Russia in the Euxine; and the obvious necessity, at this hour, of such a postulate to any scheme of Ottoman independence, only raises the national admiration for

---

\* Lord Derby's endeavour, in his speech on the Treaty of Peace, on the 5th of May, to dissociate these civil concessions from the policy of the English and French Governments—and therefore to represent them as the pure dictate of Turkish policy—was altogether unsuccessful.

the foresight and consistency of those who finally effected the fall of Sebastopol. On this double foundation, then, it will be the policy of England to raise a superstructure in the social development of the Christian races.

It is here necessary to notice two singularly illogical objections, assailing *in limine* these principles of Turkish reconstruction, and lately put forth by an eminent quarterly journal, which is regarded as an organ of Her Majesty's Opposition. We are there told—first, that the new Firman, in confirming former concessions to the Christians, must thereby confirm the former claims of Russia to interference; and secondly, that Russia will, by the terms of the Treaty itself, gain a general right of interference in their behalf, jointly with the Allied Powers. If the author of this elaborate criticism on the Government had ever perused the Treaties concluded between Russia and the Porte, he would scarcely have committed himself to notions of legal construction at which Westminster Hall and the Court of Session would stand aghast. He would then have seen that the Russian claims rested upon international Conventions wholly distinct from civil Firmans. Those claims, moreover, have since been distinctly abolished in the new Treaty. In regard to the second objection, it happens that, instead of a joint-right of interference being henceforth vested in Russia, it is expressly provided by the Treaty that—with the exceptions of the three Principalities—there shall be no right of interference whatever.

Two opposite extremes of opinion, it is known, are not only entertained in the public mind, but also divide the ablest statesmen of the present age, in reference to the fate of the Ottoman dominion in Europe. By one class of politicians, that dominion is held to be irrevocably declining; by another, to be in a stage of development and progress. But it happens that this difference of opinion is inapplicable as a test of the general satisfaction in arrangements tending immediately to the consolidation of the Turkish Empire. For, whether or not that empire really possess the elements of durable reconstruction, it must at least be our interest to maintain its existence, as the nucleus of alien races too repugnant to form a union in themselves, and as the protector of rising populations too weak to assert their individual independence. The question, then, must remain, during a long future period, not between a Slavonic and an Ottoman supremacy, but between the qualified slavery of the Christian population under Russia, and their qualified independence under the Turkish rule.

We now pass to a consideration of the prospects and condition of the Ottoman Empire under the reconstruction of its government, and the changes which have taken place in its various relations,

during the hostilities and the negotiation of the last two years. With this view we shall discuss the immediate and prospective Results of the War in the fourfold character which they present. These may be resolved into—1st, The territorial and military results, as affecting the external security of the Turkish Empire. 2d, The political results, as affecting the relations of the Christian principalities. 3d, The civil results, as affecting the co-ordinate rights of the different religions, and therefore in great degree the social equality of the different races. 4th, The commercial results, as affecting the development of Christian enterprise under the territorial stipulations in regard to the banks of the Danube, and the maritime and fiscal stipulations in regard to the coasts of the Black Sea.

I. It will be necessary, in the first place, briefly to advert to the general principles on which the Ottoman dominion is based, and to the general relations of the Mahometan to the Christian population. On this subject there are several important considerations to be entertained, and some popular misconceptions to be dispelled, in order to constitute a point of view from which the great change which is now taking place in the internal organisation of Turkey, and the great change which has already arisen in its international relations, can be justly appreciated in their influence on the future of that Empire.

The principal feature of the Ottoman dominion in Europe may be defined to consist in the aggregation of sections of two immense nationalities, of which the one has extensive relations in Europe, and the other has extensive relations in Asia. The Turkish Empire, in this continent, thus mainly rests in the conflict or combination of the extreme westerly Turks with the extreme southerly Slavonians. In no sense, therefore, either physically or morally, can these component parts of the Ottoman system in Europe be accounted isolated races. But the relation of the Slavonic Turks to the great Slavonian body which constitute the greater portion both of the Austrian and Russian Empires, though by nature similar, is in fact by far less close than the relation of the European to the Asiatic Turks; or, to speak more correctly, of the Ottoman to other branches of the great Turkish family. The sympathy subsisting between the European and ultra-European Turks, is consequently by much stronger than that which subsists between the Turkish and ultra-Turkish Slavonians. If the sympathy of the one rest upon a common love of political independence, strengthened by the traditionary sense of a common oppression, that of the other is maintained by a common religious fanaticism, and a common conviction of an inevitable conflict yet to transpire between the two races.

If, therefore, in any general struggle against the principle of super-national supremacy—as it is maintained in the east of Europe by the Muscovite, the Austrian, and the Ottoman populations—the Turkish and the extra-Turkish Slavonians would be allied; much more, in any struggle involving the alternatives of dominion or extermination to the Mahometan cause, would a similar combination immediately arise between the European and the Asiatic Turks. It involves, consequently, a complete misapprehension of the basis of the Ottoman dominion in Europe, to regard its continuance as a problem depending upon the relative strength of the Mussulman and Christian population of Turkey in that continent alone.\*

The supremacy of the Ottoman element, at once over the Slavonians in the west, and the other Turkish races in the east, of the Empire of Constantinople, rests in its political and geographical centralisation—in the tradition of conquest and the fact of possession. That element is, in every sense, as much the nucleus of the Turkish Empire, as the purely Austrian element is of the Austrian Empire, or as the Muscovite element of the Russian. In a political point of view, indeed, there are certain qualifications of this analogy. On the one hand, the exclusive spirit of the Mahometan system has hitherto rendered the Slavonic Rayas by much less serviceable than that population under the systems of Austria and Russia, in the development of the central power. On the other, this difference has been countervailed in Turkey, by the fact that the distinction of national superiority is practically a distinction not of race but of religion. The spirit of national aristocracy, which we find so strongly developed among the German and Muscovite populations respectively of the Austrian and Russian Empires, takes the form in Turkey of a religious aristocracy. It consequently happens that that portion (which is far from inconsiderable) of the Slavonic race, which has embraced the Mahometan religion, is as effectually detached from the rest of that race, as though it had owned no community of origin; and is as effectually amalgamated with the Turkish population, as though\* it had originally fought the battle of Asiatic domination on the Bosphorus. It is true that, under the reforming policy of the Central Government a quarter of a century ago, bitter animosities were developed between the Slavonic Mussulmans of Bosnia and Albania and the Turkish Mussulmans of Roumelia. But this incidental hostility only proves the truth of the general proposition; for the conflict which was then threatened between the different branches of the Mahometan population of European Turkey, arose from the

\* We have adverted, in a later part of these observations, to the causes which have compromised the natural or moral unity of the great Slavonic family.

fact that the Slavonic part of that community insisted upon a maintenance of the ancient Mussulman principles, which the Ottoman reformers of Roumelia were beginning to assail. So complete had become the integration of this Slavonic body in the Mahometan system, that they alone seemed to represent the orthodoxy and bigotry of the Faith, while "the children of the kingdom" themselves were branded by their Slavonian converts as comprehensive latitudinarians! These differences, however, have now passed away; nor is there any probability that they will be revived in any serious degree by the civil concessions which have been offered to the Rayas.

To the support of the Ottoman dominion in Europe by the Asiatic Mussulmans in the East, we have, therefore, to add that of the Slavonic Mussulmans in the West. Whether or not we may hereafter reckon the Christian races as another pillar of the Ottoman supremacy, under the civil rights which have been so liberally extended to the dependent provinces, and under the political rights which have been so faithfully maintained with the three European Principalities—a subject to which we shall presently allude—forms one of the most novel, curious, and important problems that can affect the future of the East.

This general characterisation of the dependent European races of the Porte, as Slavonian, is, we are aware, inconsistent with accurate ethnology. On the one hand, a part of the population in the extreme west of the empire, (even among the Mussulman communities themselves,) is either Hellenic or quasi-Hellenic. On the other, the people of Wallachia are not generally accounted Slavonian. But these distinctions are of little importance with a view to the present considerations. The Wallachians have scarcely a single practical point of contrast, that can be referred to an ethnological origin, with the Slavonic tribes around them. And the Greek or quasi-Greek, although they speak a different language, not only profess the same Christian religion, but acknowledge the same Eastern ritual with the mass of the Slavonian Rayas. The community of their interest has been increased by a corresponding community in their relation to the Porte, which has ever been a respecter, not of races, but of religions; and has, therefore, (excepting where rights have been forcibly secured by the dependent race, as in the instance of Servia,) regarded the Greek and the Slavonian as essentially one. This position has lately been denied by an eminent contemporary journal. But it is certain that the bond of union between the great majority of each of these populations, although slightly affected by dissensions within the Eastern communion itself, is infinitely stronger than that of the Slavonians between each other, where the con-

flict of the Latin and the Greek ritual divides the majority and the minority into positions of fierce and permanent hostility.

We are no believers, therefore, in the doctrines of Pan Slavism, so far as the spirit of nationality which they presuppose is regarded as capable of realizing practical results. Both in a political and a national point of view, the Slavonians are a divided people. Parted out into different despotisms, and oppressed in common (so far as concerns the extra-Turkish population) by the physical dominion of the Austrian and the Russian sword, they are cowed, here by the moral dominion of the Greek Church, and there by the conscious superiority of the Magyars. In Hungary, their long acquiescence in the rule of race over race, and, in Russia, their mental subjugation by the priesthood, reduce the theory of their eventual union with the Danubian races to a chimera.

Similar divisions, even in European Turkey, assail the scheme of a Slavonic amalgamation. There, unquestionably, they are generally a far nobler people, and possess almost inexhaustible elements of social and political development. But we have already shewn that the Slavonic population in that empire is already divided into Mahometan and Christian; and that, even if we were to eliminate the whole of the former section from the proposed elements of a Slavonic union, yet more invincible divisions would survive between the Latin and the Greek branches of the latter. It is obvious, therefore, that a scheme of government which can in any manner combine the Slavonic population of Turkey, must presuppose the existence of a central polity, immediately founded upon a central race, which at once concedes liberty and retains supremacy.

The Turkish religion, moreover, however inadequate it may be to the various requirements of government and of social progress, has here one salient advantage over the Christian, in the causation of political union. Mahometan Turkey consists of one empire and one religion. The distinctions of religious opinion, among the Mussulman population of Western Asia, are co-extensive with the distinctions of civil dominion. The differences subsisting between the Sunnites and the Shiites, who each contend for the spiritual supremacy in the Eastern world, are not, indeed, dissimilar from those represented by the Greek Patriarchate and the Latin Papacy. But while single provinces of Christian Turkey are dis severed from each other by the conflict of these hostile Churches, the great Mahometan schism corresponds to the boundary of the Turkish and the Persian empires. In addition, therefore, to the considerations already recounted as influential in the future of the Turkish nation, we must take into view the unity of the dominant religion.

Four leading distinctions mark the relation of the Ottoman Government to its dependent provinces. *First*, we find those which are chiefly Mahometan, such as Roumelia; *secondly*, those divided between the Mahometan and the Christian, such as Albania and Bosnia; *thirdly*, those chiefly Christian, as Bulgaria; and *lastly*, the Principalities, which, while they are Christian, are also virtually free. To this classification, the Greek inhabitants of the islands and seaports of the *Ægean* may perhaps be added, as a fifth point of distinction in the religious and social constitution of European Turkey.

There can be no error more complete, and yet there is none more common, than to refer the peculiar rights of the Christian Principalities to the national or political decline of the Ottoman power. Such a theory, too, implies a strange historical misconception. Those Principalities, under the weakest organisation of surrounding states, have been seldom actually free; and, with the strongest governments around them, they have been more often partially independent. During the age in which the Kings of Hungary were the only powerful potentates of the East of Europe, not only the Principalities, but other provinces of the Danube (such as Bosnia), possessed their own kings, who acknowledged only a titular supremacy in the Kings of Hungary. Even in the age of Solymán the Magnificent, by whom those Kings of Hungary were overthrown, Moldavia and Wallachia retained a virtual independence more complete than they possessed before the recent war, and equal at least to that which they will probably receive from their new constitution. If we refer to the terms of the treaty concluded by that great Sovereign with these principalities, more than three centuries ago, we shall find them strikingly similar to those which are shadowed forth in the Peace of Paris. In Serbia, indeed, there was lately a desperate struggle in which the Slavonic element triumphed, and the Turkish element was overthrown. Contests such as these must arise from the conflict of authority produced either by the development of the dependent province, or from the oppression of misgovernment. In the former case, they can no more imply the declension of the central power than the voluntary concession of legislative rights to rising colonies, under an apprehension that those concessions will soon become inevitable; and in the latter, they merely imply the existence of a resisting force. The Servian war remains a monument, not of the weakness, but of the impolicy of the Porte: the assimilation of systems so alien as the Servian and the Turkish could only end in a conflict for supremacy; while the Principalities were still capable of being bound up with the Porte in a concurrent policy and a reciprocity of interest.

It would be equally incorrect to regard the moral alienation of the Slavonian from the Turkish sway as commensurate even with the prevalence of the Christian religion in the Empire. The conflict of social and religious interests which has arisen within each province has often invented a balance or counterpoise of forces, in which, if not the Mahometan religion, at least the Turkish Government, has become the protector of one or other of the parties upon the Christian side. Thus, the Porte has frequently become the ally of the municipal against the territorial element. Thus, again, it has often protected the Latin against the Greek, and the Greek against the Latin Communion. The Sultans have in this manner stood in a similar relation to sections of their Christian subjects with that of the German Emperors towards the free towns of the empire, where an identity of interest was developed between opposite extremes of political rank.

So far as the Christian Principalities are concerned, this moral alienation is likely to become altogether extinct. The antipathy of the Christian to the Turkish population has been maintained not by a spirit of Panslavism, but by the traditions of Turkish tyranny, which have been perpetuated by the Russian Government, acting through the instrumentality of the Greek priesthood. Three concurrent reasons now threaten to extinguish these hostile sentiments upon the Christian side. *First*, The legal rights of these Principalities will at once be clearly and determinately defined, and will be guaranteed, not simply on the faith of the Turkish Government, but on that of the Five Great Powers: *secondly*, The influence of Russia will, by these very means, be greatly curtailed, if not absolutely destroyed: *thirdly*, The oppression lately experienced at the hands of that State by Moldavia and Wallachia, has, it is notorious, already alienated their population from her standard. The Commission, therefore, which is now charged with the formation of a political organisation for these provinces, assumes its duties in a period more favourable than any other to the development of an alliance between them and the central power, and in which the titular supremacy of the Porte is viewed as the surest safeguard to the contingent aggressions of the Czar.

It will have been seen, then, what are the principal elements of the Turkish dominion, which forms the basis of the whole political organisation of the East, and the maintenance of which is clearly essential to the development of the races which now acknowledge its supremacy on the shores of the Danube and of its tributary streams. We have seen the sovereignty of the central race supported, first, by the Turkish population of Asia; and secondly, by the Slavonic population

which has embraced Mahometanism in Europe. Thirdly, we have seen the Christian races which form an exterior semi-circle around the central and dominant people frequently divided against each other. Fourthly, we have observed the acute policy of the Porte availing itself of these divisions to constitute for itself alliances, more often indeed temporary than durable, out of the mutually hostile sections of its natural antagonists. Fifthly, we have seen the insidious influence exerted by Russia and Austria among the Christian population essentially weakened, if not altogether destroyed. When we add to these elements of moral and physical dominion, the military and naval forces actually in the command of the Ottoman Porte—the influence arising from its prescriptive superiority—the treaties, and the facts stronger than any treaties, by which the great Western Powers have identified its existence with their ultimate independence—we shall acknowledge that a policy of moderation and liberality towards its Christian subjects is alone necessary to the maintenance of its supremacy in the East of Europe against the principle of internal revolution.

Yet, as a counterpoise to all this political mechanism—in virtue of which the Ottoman rule appears to be more firmly secured than that of almost any other such dominant population in Europe, and forms at this day the strong basis of Christian liberty—we are continually met by the Phil-hellenic party in this country, with the assertion, which scorns either arguments or facts, that the alleged moral decline of the Turkish people is surely working the political destruction of the Turkish Government, and that the Greek people are fast rising to supremacy in the East. It is certainly by a very oblique process of reasoning, that, whenever the atrocities daily committed by the Hellenic people are brought to view, the apology of the misgovernment of Otho is always tendered in mitigation of their conduct; while no such apology is admitted for the Turks, who, unquestionably, have long stood among the worst governed of the populations of Europe. With what possible consistency, too, is such a view of the prospects before the two nations to be maintained at this day, when an essential improvement has taken place in the Turkish organisation, and when no such improvement is likely to be effected in the Greek? We shall not, however, enter at length upon such a discussion; because the question before this country, as we have said, is, not whether the Turkish dominion shall be upheld, but—what is the Christian superstructure to be raised upon the basis of its existence? These two salient facts, however, are undeniable—that while the Turks continue to be the most orderly population of Europe, the Greeks, after thirty years of freedom, are in now

great measure a populace divided into bandits by land and pirates by sea : and that while trade and agriculture are almost extinguished in Greece, the commerce of Turkey (and we are not speaking of its principalities) now stands at an unexampled height.\*

If it be urged that the present commerce of Turkey is more largely to be ascribed than that of other nations to a foreign stimulus, it may be said in reply that such a stimulus could produce no result upon an effete or demoralised population ; and it may be asked why no corresponding efforts have been made to develop the natural fertility of Peloponnesus ? We are told, again, to contrast the educational institutions of the elder Sultans, with the mental condition which is implied at this day in the fact that the Turkish Government is conducted by extra-Turkish intellect. But here we are apt, on the one hand, to overlook the broad distinction between theory and practice, and, on the other, to forget that the same resort to the subtle intellect of Greece has characterised every period of the Ottoman rule. In truth, it is simply necessary to glance at Mr. Creasy's popular work, in order to be convinced that, in periods intervening between different epochs of the Ottoman glory, the Turkish power frequently fell far lower in the European scale than at the present day—and held its very existence on a tenure absolutely precarious. The heroism of the Greeks will perpetuate their existence ; and they will always remain an important element—though rather a populace than a people—in the politics of the East of Europe. But they will be powerful only in active resistance to oppression, and not in the steady maintenance of peace :—nor is it possible to predict of a nation so strangely deficient in all the conditions of public and private morality, that primacy in the government of the East, which may ultimately devolve upon some Christian race, and which we may fairly predict of Servia, if the Ottoman power should, at some remote period, be overthrown.

II. We now diverge from a consideration of the general principles or conditions of the Empire of the Turk, to the application of the Treaty of Peace to such a system of government. That treaty is to be regarded in its relation—first, to the external, and, se-

---

\* Mr. Bright, in one of those heavy jokes which he has the misfortune to mistake for rhetorical declamation, lately stated in the House of Commons that, "whether or not the British Government had ruined Russia, it was generally agreed that they had ruined Turkey." We shall presently have occasion to advert to the fact that the commerce of the Ottoman empire is now largely upon the increase ; and that, within a few years after the war concluded by the treaty of Adrianople, it had risen in a degree of which there had then been no precedent.

condly, to the purely internal interests of Turkey. We deal in the first instance with the former.

In estimating the general results of the recent war, it must be remembered that the Allied Governments, at the commencement of hostilities, laid down two principles of action, which, independently of the subsequence of a moral obligation to abide by them, were, we conceive, consistent throughout with a sound policy. By the first of these, it was held that the general basis of the Vienna Settlement of 1815 should not be disturbed; and by the second, that the war should not on our side be a war of territorial spoliation. It is unnecessary at the present day to vindicate these principles, further than by saying that the former condition obviated the fearful peril of a war of nationalities, which would have extended hostilities over the whole theatre of Europe, and have rendered absolutely desperate the re-establishment of peace; and that the latter proceeded upon the just assumption that any great extension of the Turkish territory was at once unnecessary to its security, and inconsistent with its political organisation.

Within this double restriction, the Treaty of Paris has effected a triple reconstruction of the *external* relations of the British empire. This arises, *first*, in the maritime stipulations of that treaty; *secondly*, in the stipulations which guarantee the political and territorial integrity of the Principalities; and *thirdly*, in those which re-organize the commercial system of the Euxine. The partition of Bessarabia, which forms another condition of the Treaty, has a mixed character, inasmuch as it involves a territorial acquisition, obtained, in great degree, for a commercial object.

We touch first on the maritime question.

The neutralisation of the Euxine forms the necessary result of the retrocession, first of the Ottoman, and then of the Russian dominion upon that sea. The acquisition of a portion of its shores by Russia deprived it of the character of an inland water, and was followed by a rivalry of fleets of war upon its northern and southern coasts. When, however, the Russian navy, which had menaced the existence of Turkey, was destroyed, and it became only just to that State to stipulate against its reconstruction, it became reciprocally just towards Russia to concede, that those waters in which either party had a common interest, but which were restricted against the Russian, should also be restricted against the Turk.

This neutralisation is thus defined:—

#### ARTICLE 11.

“The Black Sea is neutralised. Its waters and its ports, thrown open

to the mercantile marine of every nation, are formally, and in perpetuity, interdicted to the flag of war, *either of the Powers possessing its coasts, or of any other Power, with the exceptions mentioned in Articles 14 and 19 of the present treaty.*"

We have ourselves represented the act of neutralisation as a deduction from the condition against a reconstruction of the Russian fleet. The treaty, however, represents this latter provision as a corollary from the adoption of the principle of neutralisation. Thus :—

#### ARTICLE 13.

"The Black Sea being neutralised, according to the terms of Article 11, the maintenance or establishment upon its coast of military-maritime arsenals becomes alike unnecessary and purposeless; in consequence his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, and his Imperial Majesty the Sultan, engage not to establish or to maintain upon that coast any military-maritime arsenal."

The distinction is not material; and either condition is dependent upon the other.

The qualifications to this general law, established by Articles 14 and 19, concern, *first*, the right of either Power in possession of the coast to maintain a flotilla of six steamers of 800 tons each; and *secondly*, that of each of the contracting parties to station two light vessels at the mouth of the Danube. The right of special permission, vesting in the Porte, for the passage of additional light vessels engaged in the service of the diplomatic missions, is also of course reserved, by the terms of the first convention. The sinister suspicions to which the former of these qualifications has given rise, if we may refer to the expressions which have appeared in certain journals, are simply irrational and preposterous. The possession of at least twelve hundred miles of coast by either of the Powers in whose favour the exception in question is made, obviously demands a certain naval force for the maintenance of government. A single vessel for each 200 miles is scarcely to be regarded as more than proportionate to the necessities of the State.

This neutralisation of the Black Sea is directly associated with the prohibition of the Channel of Constantinople to foreign ships of war, originally asserted in a period in which the inland character of the Euxine would have rendered the right of passage through the Dardanelles a direct violation of the political integrity of Turkey—confirmed, under the maritime rivalry of Russia, in the Treaty of the Dardanelles (1809) from a view of public interests—confirmed again, in the same circumstances, in the Treaty of the 13th of July 1841—and now re-asserted in the

Treaty and First Convention of Paris, under the extinction of the Russian navy in these waters. According to the terms, indeed, of the 10th Article, we read that "The Convention of the 13th of July 1841, which maintains the ancient rule of the Ottoman empire relative to the closing of the Straits of the Bosphorus and of the Dardanelles has been *revised* by common consent." The language, however, is not quite accurate (either in the translation or in the original;) for the terms of the Convention itself re-impose nearly the same conditions with those of 1841. The maintenance, indeed, of these provisions obviously continues to be essential to the security of the Turkish capital, and to the prevention of a rivalry of naval demonstrations in the Euxine, even although their operation has practically ceased upon the side of the Bosphorus. The present Convention will form, we fear, a death-blow to the reputation of Mr. David Urquhart, who had lingered on as the prince of political false-prophets, confiding in the ultimate abrogation of the Treaty of the 13th of July!

It will be the result, therefore, of the maritime stipulations of the Treaty of Paris, so far as they have a purely military sense, to maintain the pre-existent principles established for the government of these waters, with such a difference of application as is necessitated by an immediate difference of actual relations. The neutralisation of the Euxine will further provide against a recurrence of such a conflict of policy as that which threatened the peace of Europe in 1839.

III. We deal, next, with the Christian Principalities, as being involved in the territorial question at issue in reference to the shores of the Black Sea, and in the political question of their exclusive dependence upon the Porte. We shall treat of those semi-independent states both on the European and on the Asiatic frontier conjunctively, and shall afterwards advert to the condition of the dependent provinces of the Ottoman Empire in Europe.

Between the Christian principalities of the Danube and those of Trans-Caucasia, this broad distinction, in a constitutional point of view, is now universally known to exist—that while the former constitute the titular dominion of Turkey, the latter form the titular dominion of Russia. As a result, therefore, of the second of the two general principles which we have described as *restraining* the extent of the war, these established facts have been substantially respected in the Treaty of Peace. The only prominent exception to the operation of this rule rests in "the rectification of the Bessarabian frontier," which, under this unassuming title, cedes, in fact, nearly one-half of the Bessarabian soil to Turkey.

As the policy of this territorial cession appears to have been totally misapprehended, both by Mr. Layard and by the quarterly journal to which we have referred, (the views of which exhibit a more than casual coincidence with his own,) it may be useful here to dispel an erroneous representation. By this authority and by that gentleman it has been asserted "that the allies ought to have been in a condition to have demanded the line of the Dniester"—thus claiming a cession of the whole, instead of the half, of Bessarabia. Now we have already stated that the object of this acquisition was not territorial, but commercial—and that the commercial object had reference simply to the emancipation of the mouths of the Danube, which Russia had retained under the Treaty of Adrianople. If we refer to the recent works of Mr. Oliphant, we shall find him describing the people of Bessarabia as so inferior to those of the Principalities in every attribute of nationality and civilisation, that Turkey can be supposed to derive little direct advantage from their allegiance. It was therefore of little consequence to that Empire whether its frontier were drawn from Bournasola to Katamori, or whether it were thrown back to the Dniester. The commercial advantages arising from the navigation of this latter river could only have been attained in the event of a cession of its left, as well as of its right, bank to Turkey—a demand which would have been equivalent to a disruption of the Congress. Such an arrangement, moreover, would have been directly inconsistent with the ground upon which the line of the Dniester has been urged by Mr. Layard—that it would form a natural boundary. The utility of such a boundary must rest chiefly in its facilities of defence: those facilities must be necessarily lost if this natural boundary be not continuous with the whole frontier: and it is only by a singular geographical illusion that the Dniester can be supposed to present any such condition of security at all. There are, no doubt, those gentlemen in the House of Commons, whose exclusion from any participation in public affairs, may lead them to an oblique contemplation of the merits of arrangements concluded without their aid; and it is, therefore, only in consequence of the publication of similar statements on the part of a leading contemporary, that we have lingered, at this point, over so indefensible a position.

IV. These, then, being the general territorial arrangements in reference to either extremity of the Black Sea shore, we propose to touch, in the first instance, upon the Asiatic or Trans-Caucasian Principalities. Three obvious, though not equally practicable, alternatives presented themselves in reference to these provinces. Either, first, they must be left in the hands of Russia: or, secondly, they must be rendered absolutely independent: or,

thirdly, they must be restored, subject to the continuance of their local governments, to the suzeraineté of Turkey, the abolition of which had been effected by Russia, a considerable period before. The former of these alternatives, as we are all aware, and as we might all have expected, has been resolved on. Yet there are several writers who lately have warily insisted upon one of the two latter conditions of the independence of these states.

Three concurrent considerations, however, command our acquiescence in a clearly inevitable arrangement. In the first place, the liberation of Trans-Caucasia could only have been attained after a vigorous and successful prolongation of the war. In the second, the organization of that territory, when delivered from the Russian yoke, would have involved difficulties which we shall describe, and of which it is impossible, even in theory, to discover any satisfactory solution. In the third place, it happens, that while the dominion of Russia has been more effectually circumscribed in those provinces than in any other portion of her empire, such commercial advantages are reserved in the Treaty of Paris as will largely promote the trade and international intercourse of the Asiatic Principalities.

By the scheme of Mr. Oliphant, the rivers Terek and Kuban were to form the Russian frontier towards the Caucasus. The territory, therefore, to be comprised in such an abdication of sovereignty by the Czar, consisted of all those Principalities, chiefly Christian, which lay between the Caucasian range upon the north, and the actual Turkish frontier on the south; and also of the provinces, almost altogether Mahometan, intervening between the northern slopes of the Caucasus and the river Kuban designed as a boundary of the Russian dominion in that quarter. According to the essential points of contrast which these provinces present towards each other, we may describe them as consisting, 1. of the four chiefly Christian Principalities upon the sea-board of the Euxine, bounded by the Caucasus to the north, by Georgia to the east, and by Turkish Armenia to the south; 2. of the other provinces stretching between these Principalities and the Caspian, and similarly intervening between the Turkish frontier and the Caucasus, being also chiefly Christian; 3. of the Mahometan provinces already described as lying between the Caucasus and the Kuban, and, 4. of the marauding mountaineers, as distinguished from the people of the plain. Such were the discordant elements which it was proposed to unite into one homogeneous body.

Of the two alternatives which we have described as remaining, if that of a Russian dominion were rejected, it is difficult to determine which would have been encompassed by the greater difficulty. We will take, first, the question of a Turkish suze-

raineté to be instituted as a guarantee of the virtual independence of these provinces. There can be no doubt that the frontier of the rivers Terek and Kuban would have formed, in some respects, an excellent one for Turkey; inasmuch as, beyond the stony boundary of the Caucasus, a Mahometan and warlike race would have stood at the outpost of danger, and have served in some degree the purpose of the 'Military Frontier' of the Austrian Empire in Hungary.

But it is clear that the imposition of a Turkish suzeraineté would be altogether inapplicable to the Christian provinces which form by much the larger portion of the territory here in question. That species of supremacy can only exist upon one of these two conditions. Either it may be newly imposed upon a people well affected towards the principles which regulate this sovereign government; or, when existing in antagonism to all popular predilections, it can exist by the force of prescription alone. Here lies the broad contrast between the Christian Principalities of Asia and those of Europe. If we refer to the fourth article of the Treaty of Adrianople, we shall find that, so long as twenty-seven years ago, the Caucasian provinces were dealt with upon either side as avowedly a traditional possession of Russia. "*Georgia, Mingrelia, Imeritia, Gouriel, and several other provinces of the Caucasus, having been for a long time and in perpetuity annexed to the Empire of Russia,*" &c. —(Treaty of Adrianople, Art. iv.) But it singularly happened that, while the principle of Turkish suzeraineté had become altogether alienated from the inhabitants of these Christian provinces, the traditions of Turkish government still tenaciously clung to the popular mind, in which that dominion was associated, however fallaciously, with the worst tyranny and with total subjugation. While the European Principalities had begun to appreciate the signal change which had affected the Ottoman policy, the Asiatic Principalities, on the other hand, had been altogether withdrawn for a very long period from its influence, excepting in the instances in which the incursions of a Turkish army, during a war between Russia and the Porte, had naturally revived the odious recollections of the ancient Ottoman rule. As, therefore, the institution of a Turkish supremacy over these provinces would have aimed at the imposition not of a physical but of a moral, not of a real but of a titular, dominion, it is equally clear, on the one hand, that that supremacy would have been disdainfully rejected by the will of the Christian people, and, on the other, that there would have been no means for its enforcement, even if an adoption of such a course had not been on other grounds altogether subversive of the ends which it was designed to promote.

We now come to the only remaining alternative, viz., that which

proposes the complete emancipation of the provinces lying between the Turkish frontier and the Kuban, and either their single independence, or their incorporation into one sovereign Confederacy of States. Very similar reasons, however, to those which would have precluded the institution of an Ottoman suzeraineté, would also have precluded the combination of these provinces. It is almost impossible to conceive that the Christians to the south, and the Mahometans to the north of the Caucasus, could have formed a union. It is altogether impossible to suppose that such a union could have been formed between either the one or the other, and the mountaineers, whom they both hate and dread yet more than they hate and dread either the Russians or the Turks. Nor is it easy to understand how any scheme of policy, excluding those mountaineers from its consideration, could have been compatible with the security—we mean not the political independence assailed by Russia, but with the very social rights—of the Christian provinces, which were almost altogether without means of defence.

If this, then, were an obstacle to a confederation of the states, much more was it an obstacle to their single independence. Moreover, even in exclusion of the mountaineers, it is clear that, without an effective union between the different provinces, their rights would again be trenched upon, one by one, on the part of the Russian Government, in a manner which would require the closest supervision upon our part. Mr. Oliphant, indeed, tells us that we ought to have made Abkhasia independent, because its Prince, Michael, less prudent than the other chiefs, had committed himself to our cause. But while he acknowledges that such a policy would hereafter involve much contingent intervention upon our part, he must remember that the neutralisation of the Euxine would render such an intervention impossible, not only by ourselves, but even by the Turkish Government. And this maritime neutralisation has been dictated by considerations far more important than that of territorial independence. Mr. Oliphant, indeed, assures us that any aggression committed by Russia to the south of the Caucasus, would present dangers of sufficient magnitude to render the renewal of a war between ourselves and that Empire both justifiable and expedient. The practical question, however, rests in the view which the British people would take of such justice and expediency; and it may be remembered that only twenty-eight years ago, the British Government, which presumptively represents the opinion of the British people, did not consider the Turkish Empire itself worth the hazard of hostilities. We can never predicate of a future period the complications to which war, even upon the most apparently restricted theatre, may give rise; nor can we conceive any more inexpedient course than

that which, by making territorial changes, even if we were to concede that they were immediately and abstractly beneficial, would proportionately multiply the contingencies of war.

While, therefore, we acquiesce, for these reasons, in the maintenance of the Russian supremacy over the Christian Principalities of Asia, as the only practicable course that could have presented itself, even if hostilities had been prolonged with a view to their emancipation, it by no means follows that they are therefore to be regarded as incorporated into the Russian Empire. The natural hardihood of their inhabitants—their remoteness from the strongholds of the Muscovite power—the intervention of the Caucasian range—and, above all, the indomitable mountaineers whom Russia, if she follow a policy of subjugation with merely military forces, must effectually overpower before she can effectually overpower the Principalities of Trans-Caucasia—present obstacles to the dominion of the Czar which will insure to these territories a certain qualified independence. Even under the system preceding the recent war, the four western Principalities of Imeritia, Abkhasia, Gouriel, and Mingrelia, had their own governments: they recognised four distinct orders in their respective states—the reigning family, the nobles, the freemen, and the serfs. From these territories the Russian forces were usually excluded; and Mr. Oliphant tells us that the Princess of Imeritia had made so excellent a bargain with the Court of St. Petersburg, as to obtain from the Russian treasury an annual payment for the maintenance of a militia four thousand strong, while, in fact, her Highness only maintained as many hundreds in arms, and retained the proportionate difference of the Russian annuity in the exchequer of her principality! Circumstances such as these indicate the possession of jural rights scarcely less complete, and of actual advantages yet more considerable, than those enjoyed by Servia in its relations with the Porte. The question at issue, therefore, in these Principalities, was not a question of Russian dominion, but of Russian suzeraineté.

While, on the other\*hand, it cannot be denied that the oppressive commercial system of Russia has hitherto checked the enterprise of Mingrelia, it will be seen, from the following reasons, that that system is henceforth terminated. On this head, we quote Mr. Oliphant's statement:—

“It was necessary to Russia, after she had acquired Georgia, that she should possess some port upon the Black Sea. She therefore purchased the right of trading at Redoute Kaleh, and reserved to herself the privilege of levying dues, and making whatever mercantile regulations she might think proper there. The restrictive policy which characterizes her commercial relations generally, was of course enforced here; but the Mingrelians, who had retained the right of doing what they

pleased at any other part of the sea-board, naturally wished to avoid this tax upon their trade by choosing some other point of entry. No sooner, however, did they attempt this, than Russia seized their goods as contraband, and has ever since established a preventive service to obstruct the prosecution of that free commerce, to the enjoyment of which they have a perfect right. "The spirit of the population is thoroughly mercantile, and they desire nothing more earnestly than to assist in developing resources probably not surpassed, in extent and variety, by any country in the world. Almost the sole use which is made at present of the only navigable river in the province, the Rhion, is as a means of carrying so-called contraband goods into the interior."—*Oliphant's Trans-Caucasia.*

It appears, then, that while the political rights of the Asiatic Principalities are such as secure the freedom, and afford a basis for the social development, of their population, the commercial oppression under which they have hitherto laboured, is the only attribute of Russian dominion which has thwarted their natural growth. We apprehend that a recurrence of this evil is effectually provided against by one great incident in the war, and by one prominent stipulation in the treaty. We find that the aggressive policy of Russia has been in this instance maritime and not territorial. The fleet and the harbour of Sebastopol constituted, it is clear, before the outbreak of the war, the key of her authority upon this eastern sea-board of the Euxine. Now, therefore, that her maritime dominion in these waters is destroyed, it is certain that her commercial dominion must terminate also; for her established inability to subjugate the ruling princes implies her inability to continue this commercial dominion by land.

Independently, however, of this consideration, the terms of the twelfth article of the Treaty of Peace establish a commercial system in the Black Sea, wholly irreconcilable with the renewal or continuance of any such restrictions upon trade:—

#### ARTICLE 12.

"Free from any impediment, the commerce in the ports and waters of the Black Sea shall be subject only to regulations of health, customs, and police, framed in a spirit favourable to the development of commercial transactions. In order to afford the commercial and maritime interests of every nation the security that is desired, Russia and the Sublime Porte will admit consuls into their ports situated upon the coast of the Black Sea, in conformity with the principles of International Law."

It is clear that, by the terms of this article, the Russian Government has pledged itself to an abolition of the restrictive system which has depressed the commercial energies of the Christian Principalities of Asia. It must be conceded, indeed,

that any jurist, without knowing more of the constitutional relations subsisting between them and the Russian Court than what is implied in the fact (if it be correctly stated) that the latter had purchased the right of trading at one of the ports of Mingrelia, would pronounce for the recognition by Russia of indefeasible rights—that is, of rights alienable only by voluntary concession. The customs system established by Russia, in this Principality at least, must consequently have been as illegal as it was oppressive. The twelfth article of the Treaty has a special importance in affording to the Six Powers a continual right of representation to the Court of St. Petersburg, if the obligation which it entails upon that Government be not faithfully discharged. Her Majesty's Government, there is no doubt, will establish consulates in all those ports of the Black Sea where their institution is likely to develop the interchange of this country with the Russian coasts; and nothing can more effectually tend at once to promote the commercial growth, and to establish the political security, of the Asiatic Principalities than their integration, in this manner, with the international system of Europe.

These provinces exhibit just those natural elements of wealth which a free commercial policy is calculated to develop. Their territory comprises not less than a hundred and fifty miles of the sea-board of the Euxine. It extends to a distance of eighty miles inland. The aggregate population does not exceed 500,000. Three of the four provinces almost unanimously profess the Christian faith. Abkhasia alone possesses any considerable proportion of Mahometans. This, indeed, has been a natural result of the immediate intervention of her narrow territory between the coast and the Mussulmans of Circassia. No country has greater facilities of internal transport than each of these provinces. The whole territory is intersected by rivers within a distance of every few miles. Many of these rivers are both deep and wide. Owing to the disproportion which has so long existed between the territory and the population, a large tract of these provinces continues to consist of woodland. There can be no doubt that the trade which a liberal customs system would throw open to these provinces is very considerable. Under any arrangement, resort must still be had to their rivers for the transport of the whole western commerce of Georgia, which has no outlet into Europe except through Mingrelia and Imeritia, whose rivers extend over nearly the whole distance between the sea-coast and the Georgian frontier. Georgia, indeed, has ample rivers of her own; but those rivers communicate only with the Caspian. The population is industrious and commercial; the original rigour of its differences of social condition has been mitigated; and although, with nearly every other country in a

state of partial civilisation, the element of serfdom enters into its political society, the meanest condition which it recognises is that of a serf attached to the soil—not that of a slave exported to the Ottoman markets.

V. We now advert to the question of the Principalities of the Danube, titularly subject to the Porte in nearly the same degree as the Principalities of Asia are practically subject to Russia.

The basis of the constitution of these provinces—although nominally existing in the subordination of their political rights to the exclusive suzeraineté of the Ottoman Porte—rests, in effect, in the subordination of those rights to a double suzeraineté, vested conjunctively in the Porte and the high contracting Powers. The Sultan continues to be regarded in the character of lord paramount of the Moldavian and Wallachian soil. The civil rights which the Treaty acknowledges to rest in the inhabitants of that territory are regarded as directly arising from his spontaneous will—and the political organization which has yet to be devised is immediately to take effect under a *Hatti-sheriff* issued by the Porte. But by the terms of the Treaty, every act, whether of immediate legal organization or of contingent interference, that is contemplated in reference to the three Principalities, is to originate neither with the Porte nor with the contracting Powers solely, but with these Powers and with that Government conjunctively.\* Thus, the constitution to be ultimately instituted for Moldavia and Wallachia by the Porte, is to be no other than that which shall have been already determined in a future Conference of the Contracting Powers, which is to be held at Paris. Thus, again, the Turkish right of military intervention, either in those provinces or in Servia, is only to proceed upon the anterior sanction of the same Powers.

Such an arrangement, while it recognises the abstract principle of a double intervention imposed by the traditionary policy of the Czars, establishes this important difference of application—that it substitutes the general and civilizing influence of Europe for the special and barbarizing influence of Russia. No other course could satisfy the double necessity of giving an effectual sanction to the definitive emancipation of Christian provinces from Mahometan masters, and of offering a permanent guarantee against the progress of Russian dominion on the Danube. Nor could any less comprehensive condition secure the internal

---

\* Turkey, indeed, is herself one of the Contracting Powers. But this circumstance only illustrates the compatibility of the rights assumed by those Powers with the suzerain rights specially reserved to her, inasmuch as the former, arising out of a treaty which she has signed, are to be presumed to be partial abdications of supremacy upon her part in their favour.

liberty which is essential to the social development of the provinces.

Thus far our observations apply to the three Principalities in common. We have now to touch specially on the constitutional question in reference to Moldavia and Wallachia. It must not be supposed that the former organisation of those states, which is now happily suppressed, presented the elements, even independently of Russian intrigue, of satisfactory government. The intrinsic evils of that constitution were probably equal to the ancillary evils of Muscovite domination. Indeed, the polity of these principalities was just such as must have been designed with the view of favouring that foreign rule. Under every show of theoretical liberty it insured the imposition of every kind of practical despotism. With a view of illustrating the character of this system of administration, we need not refer further than to the Treaty of Ackerman, concluded thirty years ago between Russia and the Porte. In the *Acte séparé* [of this treaty] *relatif aux Principautés de Moldavie et de Valachie*, it is agreed that the Hospodars shall be elected by *les Bojars du Divan de chaque province, et avec l'accord général des habitans*. But there is no provision whatever for the actual expression of the popular will: and there is no doubt that the Russian or the Turkish candidate was forced upon the local Divans, either in virtue of an agreement, or of a battle of intrigue, between the two Courts. The Porte, indeed, was speciously allowed the exclusive right of confirming the election of the Divan; but it was at the same time provided that the right of refusing confirmation could only be exercised by the two Courts conjunctively; and as the ordinary predominance of Russian over Turkish influence in those provinces generally secured the election of the Russian nominee, it followed that the Sultan was compelled to confirm the choice of the Czar. By this treaty, the tenure of office by the Hospodar was determined to be seven years; and the same officer was capable of re-election. By the Treaty of Adrianople—three years afterwards—the office was made tenable for life. These governors were in no way amenable to their subjects on a charge of misgovernment: they were removable only by the concurrence of the Russian and Turkish Courts; nor had the Principality itself either a voice in the decision, or a share in the process. Even the higher classes of the people, under this oppressive constitution, had no appreciable power in the government; it being provided in the Treaty of Ackerman,—“*Les Bojars seront tenues d'exécuter les ordres des Hospodars, et de rester envers eux dans les bornes d'une parfaite soumission.*”—*Acte séparé*.\*

---

\* These quotations from the several Treaties may be verified by a reference to the *Recueil des Traités*—Martens et Cussy—tom. vi.

We may refer to two other stipulations illustrative of the commercial and military, as well as of the constitutional, authority, here arrogated by Russia. The first of these—which is a part of the same separate Act of the Treaty of Ackerman—asserts that the Hospodars “shall attend to the commercial representations both of the minister and consuls of the Czar.” It is obvious that such a stipulation affords very little short of a co-ordinate jurisdiction to the Russian representatives with the Hospodar himself, upon commercial questions. The second of the two stipulations to which we have referred—which forms part of the third convention annexed to the Treaty of Adrianople—fixes the military force, which it designates under the name of “armed guards,” at the lowest possible point that may be necessary for the maintenance of civil order. By these two provisions Russia successively gained a commercial jurisdiction over the two Principalities during peace, and insured their inability to resist in the event of war.

It is clear, therefore, that the new organization of these Principalities—although it may proceed upon the same recognition of existing social characteristics—must be distinctly different from that which is now suppressed, and which was at once based upon internal despotism, and was indissociable from external intrigue. The double object conceived in the Treaty of Peace is that of instituting a scheme of polity which shall maintain a popular freedom proportionate to social elevation, and which shall conform, in its general principles, to the opinions of the classes whom it purposes to enfranchise. With this view, as it is well known, a commission created by the Seven Powers, and a local Divan convoked in either Principality by the Sultan, are designed jointly to propose the required constitution. The external relations of such a constitution, both to the Sultan and to the European Powers in general, is already determined in the Treaty.

Two very important questions, however, the one relating to political and the other to social reconstruction, will be involved in the joint labours of the Commission and of the two Divans. We allude, first, to the union, or the continued separation, of the two Principalities; and secondly, to the maintenance or the abolition of serfdom. In regard to the former, we presume that the expression of the two Divans will be conclusive upon the question. On this point, the considerations are so numerous and conflicting, that it is difficult to predict the issue. The Moldavians and Wallachians are distinct races in respect of physical origin; but their character has generally approximated under the influence of a similar ecclesiastical and civil system. Their political traditions are those of separate government; but their real interests, in freedom and in commerce, are essentially identical.

The territory of each similarly intervenes between Russia, Austria, and Turkey Proper; but, if united, it would not form a compact dominion; and it has distinct and distant capitals. The incorporation of the two provinces into one state has been frequently urged in France during the last few months, on the ground of political security; and probably without any adequate knowledge of the conditions of society, and the state of public feeling, in the Principalities themselves. But these two considerations are obvious,—that the political strength which it is sought to derive from their union, can only be realised in the event of the correspondence of such a measure with their national predilections; and that the local Divans, constituted upon the liberal basis which has been determined on, form the best exponents of the popular will.

The question of the abolition of serfdom is one of equal difficulty and importance. It must be acknowledged, indeed, even by the most ardent philanthropists, that an immediate and total emancipation of the serfs would be liable to engender evils probably greater than it could remedy. It would trench on the most valued rights of the wealthier classes; immediately prompt those classes to return to the Russian rule; and thereby give admission to every kind of Russian influence directed in antagonism both to the interests of the Western Powers, and to the liberal government of the Principalities. These serfs are in the possession partly of ecclesiastical and partly of lay landholders. Neither class of owners will voluntarily surrender their rights in this respect, without a fully commensurate compensation, either pecuniary or territorial. It appears impossible to suggest any quarter from which an equivalent, either in money or in land, can be obtained. It was lately the policy of Prince Ghika to mitigate the condition of these serfs; but his endeavours to win over their owners to his cause signally failed. The International Commission, we hope, will adopt a course which, while it shall not hazard an immediate social revolution, shall nevertheless lay a basis for the ultimate abolition of serfdom. In this respect, they will be obliged carefully to analyse the composition of the Moldavian Divan; inasmuch as, if that body comprise any servile elements, a conflict of opinion will arise; and, if those elements be rejected, a unanimity will probably prevail in its councils, totally at variance with the social progress of the population.

Pecuniary compensation can scarcely be necessary to a justification of a policy of emancipation. We are told that owners possess a right of property in their serfs; but all rights of property are dependent upon morality; and both slavery and serfdom are now generally acknowledged, in the west of Europe, to be contrary to morality. And if it be said that a partial

exposition of morality is not to be held conclusive, it is clear that we must, within a certain latitude, act upon our own convictions; that it is on this basis that beneficial reformation has usually proceeded; that the general Congresses of Europe have invariably arrogated to themselves this political supremacy with the presumptive concurrence of the different nations; and above all, that the Conventions, which have at different periods been drawn up for these very Principalities, theoretically assert the establishment of that general liberty which a policy of emancipation involves, but which the practice of government has ignored. On these grounds, therefore, we consider the question of jural right as already determined in favour of unconditional emancipation. But at the same time it will, we cannot doubt, be the wise policy of the Commission to proceed in such a manner as neither violently to alienate the affections of the dominant classes, nor suddenly to create a social revolution which may destroy or suspend the channels of industry and labour. A majority of that body will avow themselves in favour at once of liberalism and moderation; and we can hardly question the success of the issue.

The three Principalities of the Danube are now likely to form, not so much insignificant provinces subjected to general protection, as States united with Turkey against foreign aggression, and collectively presenting a power too great to be easily overthrown. Servia alone, in virtue of her militia system, is probably capable of bringing a force of sixty or seventy thousand men into the field; and these may at any time be trained, within a short period, as a regular army. Moldavia and Wallachia may hereafter be proportionately strong; and by physical strength, by free legislation, and by commercial energy, it can hardly be doubted that the Christian Principalities will form an effectual barrier to the tyrannising and barbarising influence of the Austrian and Russian Governments, and strengthen the interests of Christianity and of commerce in the East of Europe.

VI. The question of the recent concession of civil rights to the Christian, co-ordinately with the Mahometan subjects of the Porte, in those provinces of Europe and Asia which virtually as well as titularly form an integral portion of the Ottoman Empire, is of not less importance than the question which has been last discussed. It appears to have given birth to apprehensions for the future of Turkey,—even among those who are foremost to acknowledge the theoretical justice and liberality of the measure that it involves,—which we ourselves, after much personal experience of the character of the Mussulman and the Christian people, believe to be devoid of any solid foundation.

It is said that great practical difficulties will impede the

realisation of these concessions to the Rayahs: that any such abnegations of the traditionary policy of the Turkish Empire will sustain violent opposition from the whole Mahometan population: that the genius of the Ottoman system rests upon the maintenance of an exclusive religious aristocracy: and so forth. This is no answer whatever. This is the apprehension that in all ages has constituted itself an argument against every concession that has ever been offered to necessity and justice. An application of reasoning such as this might be made with equal plausibility to every measure of reform that has been withheld by violence and urged by right. The final attainment of civil liberty has, in almost all instances, been marked by national struggles: but in no single instance that we can call to mind has the principle triumphed at the cost of the constitution which it has been intended to reform.

But apart from these considerations, it is clear that this is the policy by which Turkey is to be preserved—not that by which she is to be destroyed. The absence of this civil equality has been the cause of that internal disaffection, and of those secret intrigues, which it is the object of our national policy to terminate. The alienation of the Christians from the Turkish to the Russian Government—which has done more than the battles of a century to promote the Muscovite dominion in the South—is the very result of that tyrannous oppression which it is now sought to break up and destroy. It is apprehended that any such liberality is irreconcilable with the inherent bigotry of a Mahometan people. But this people has already been tried by similar tests. The reforming and Europeanising policy of the late Sultan was at least equally antagonistic to their social prepossessions as the present introduction of the Christians to civil rights. The storm which that policy produced, arose rather from Egypt than from internal alienation in European Turkey: and the fanaticism which dictated the insurrection that then took place, is now, it cannot be doubted, nearly extinct. The Ottoman Porte has since passed from the position of a persecuting to that of a tolerating Power. The latter attitude stood, at least, midway between its ancient and its present policy: yet no popular indignation assailed such an adoption of the general policy of the Christian States. Moreover, if these privileges had been withheld, it was inevitable that the rising power of the Christians must ultimately have produced an insurrection against the Turks, while there is no corresponding reason to apprehend that their concession will involve an insurrection of the Turks, either against the Christians, or against their own Government. The cause of justice is therefore the cause of expediency.

It has been attempted, in the quarter to which we have already referred, to demonstrate the impolicy of these conces-

sions—and the injustice of urging them upon Turkey—from the analogy of our relations with India. Few comparisons could be more infelicitous. Between the British and native populations of India, there is no commensurate civilisation : no sort of community of interest : no kind of numerical proportion : no common *national* occupation of the same territory. To argue, therefore, from the subject population of India to the subject population of Turkey, is simply preposterous.

The grant of these civil rights gains additional importance from the free character of local government in Turkey. In that Empire each village has its municipality, as freely constituted as the local jurisdictions of Spain. The inhabitants of the Turkish villages elect the members of this government, which is charged, to the total exclusion of a superior power, with the assessment and collection of the contributions distributively imposed upon each community by the Central or the Provincial Government. In the more prominent municipalities, the local rights are proportionately more important; as in the instance of Bosna-Serai, the capital town of Bosnia, where the Vizier of that province—like the Imperial functionaries in their relations with the Italian cities—is not permitted to reside within its walls. Examples such as these serve to shew that the position to which the Christians are about to be exalted, is a participation with the Mahometans, not in a subjugation under a common despotism, but in the exercise of common municipal rights.

That the antagonism of the two religions, in its influence upon social relations, has been long by no means invincible, is curiously illustrated by Mr. Urquhart in recounting his travels in Magnesia, in the course of a work published so long ago as 1831 :—

“ Among these villages I observed a most interesting fact—Turks and Christians on terms of perfect equality and good-will. The village community is far removed from the line of communication ; strangers never pass through it, so that slumbering animosities are not awakened ; there is one law for all ; they do not pay distinct poll, and land, and property taxes ; but one tax on property ; and they compound for the poll tax of the whole community, so that the Turks pay their share just as the Christians. The industry, prosperity, and information of both populations is perfectly similar ; and religion, though a difference, is not a distinction.”—*Turkey and its Resources*. P. 59.

Such, then, in a period of Mahometan fanaticism, was the *social* relation of the Christian to the Turk, where the *civil* relation involved the same equality, in privilege and in rank, with that which it is now determined to establish throughout the Ottoman Empire.\*

\* In connexion with the subject of Mahometan rule, especially its early history, we would strongly recommend to the attention of our readers, Mr. Freeman's

The vast importance of the exaltation of the Christian communities, in the development of the resources of Eastern Europe, is scarcely yet capable of being appreciated in its fullest scope. But the records of travellers already speak of the progress which has been made. Dr. Sandwith, indeed, has been appealed to in evidence of Mahometan intolerance ; of the continuance of antipathies in the dominant against the subject population ; and of an imperfect realisation in practice of the new religious law. To expect an immediate and complete observation of such a law in the vast territories of a government which has never possessed a strong central organisation, and where local privileges have been guarded, during several centuries, with the jealousy of a religious caste, would be as unreasonable as to expect social antipathies to be extinguished by a Hatti-sheriff. But Dr. Sandwith may also be appealed to in evidence of the signal impulse which a proclamation of religious equality produced among the Christians, who began to labour for the Turkish cause in the province of Kars more zealously than the Mussulmans themselves.

It may appear chimerical to advert to the possible result of the gradual infusion of Christian customs and opinions, which a religious equality must necessarily produce, in reference to the moral dominion of the two religions. By the influence, however, of these customs and opinions, Turkey has already been, in great degree, socially as well as politically Europeanised. Thus we find the political system of Turkey in great degree transformed by the maxims and principles of the Christian States. Thus we find the practice of polygamy declining among a majority of those who enjoy a high reputation in respect of other virtues of social life ; so that it may appear that the social customs of Europe are becoming the moral laws of the Turkish people. Finally, the slave-market, once the great bazaar of Constantinople, has for many years been closed ; and the trade in slaves has largely declined.

VII. If we here turn from the moral to the commercial progress of the Ottoman Empire, the prospect is not less cheering. We shall not be accused of hasty induction, if we limit our inquiries in this respect to the present century. From the returns, faithfully transcribed, in Mr. Macgregor's *Commercial Statistics*, we will first take a computation of tonnage in four periods extending from 1800 to 1840 :—

*"History and Conquests of the Saracens"*—(Oxford, Parker, 1856)—being the republication of six Lectures lately delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. The subject is handled with great clearness, ability, and impartiality, and with a full and accurate knowledge of details.

## Tonnage between England and the Turkish Empire.

Years.	Tonnage of vessels cleared.	
	Inwards.	Outwards.
1800, . . . . .	5,500	(No return.)
1820, . . . . .	7,800	4,500
1830, . . . . .	18,500	20,000
1840, . . . . .	24,000	36,000*

If we turn from this work to Mr. Macculloch's Commercial Dictionary, we find the real or declared value of the manufactured produce of the United Kingdom exported to European Turkey rising from £2,319,000 in 1844 to £2,881,000 in 1849. [Maccul. Com. Dict.—Art. *Turkey*.] If we turn again to the *Summary of Trade and Navigation* published by the Board of Trade for the five following years 1849-1853, (both inclusive,) we find the manufactured produce exported from the United Kingdom to European Turkey—exclusively of Moldavia and Wallachia—rising from the value of £2,103,000 to £3,050,000. The difference between the £2,881,000 and the £2,103,000 contained in the two tables respectively for the same year, corresponds to the difference of the Moldo-Wallachian trade, included in the former computation and excluded from the latter.

So much for the increase of British exports into Turkey.

If we now pass to the *Statistical Tables of the Board of Trade*, published by Mr. Fonblanque, and compare this increase of Turkish consumption with the increase of Turkish exportation during the same years, we are struck by results not less amazing :

## Tonnage of vessels entered in the ports of the United Kingdom from foreign countries.

	Tonnage, 1849.	Tonnage, 1853.
From Turkey, (south of the Danube,) . . . . .	96,000	155,000
Wallachia and Moldavia, . . . . .	51,000	97,000
Syria, . . . . .	3,000	9,000
Egypt,† . . . . .	86,000	152,000

These figures are taken from voluminous tables referring to different countries of Europe and Asia.

We have contented ourselves with the returns of Anglo-Turkish trade, both because they form the most important consideration in contemplating the Turkish question from a British point of view, and because they form a fair example of the general character of Ottoman commerce.

We find, then, that this Anglo-Turkish trade increased in the twenty years intervening between 1820 and 1840 from 12,300 to 60,000 tons—or by nearly four hundred per cent.—that during

\* Mr. Macgregor's Commercial Statistics. Vol. ii. p. 69.

† The great extent of Egyptian trade is obviously produced by extra-Egyptian causes. These extraneous influences have no such scope in European Turkey.

the six years intervening between 1844 and 1849, it increased by nearly *one-fourth*—that in the five following years (1849-1853) it increased by nearly *one-third*—and, finally, that the difference of tonnage, on vessels cleared from Turkey, between the whole Turkish Empire in 1820, and European Turkey alone in 1853, rests between the figures 7,800 and 252,000,\*—being a difference of between three and four thousand per cent. in the space of a third of a century.

We have seen, then, that, in thus strengthening and renovating the Ottoman Empire, we have been dealing with a political system neither effete in point of national energy, nor insecure in the foundations of its power. We have seen that the rapid increase of its commerce promises to raise its position among the nations of the world. It has been shewn that the internal policy of the Turkish Government—dictated originally by the counsels of Great Britain—is directly calculated to accomplish the problem of binding up the interests of the Christian and the Turk; and of morally uniting alien races under the common bond of liberty, of commerce, and of religious rights. It is not less to be noted, that the declaration of Maritime Laws, in the suppression of privateering, and in the recognition of the rights of neutral flags and neutral goods, indicates a corresponding advance in the moderation of the Maritime Powers. And here it may be observed that Lord Derby's assertion in the House of Lords, that the British Minister at the Congress "had taken advantage of his position, thus to sign away one attribute of the sovereignty of England," was altogether indefensible: because the right which was thus conceded had no other utility to England than as an engine of reciprocity; and because that right had been simultaneously surrendered by all the Maritime Powers of Europe. This, in truth, is but one of many instances of the manner in which the Conservative party have alienated themselves from the sympathies of the people of Great Britain, by their steadfast opposition to every concession which Her Majesty's Government have offered to humanity, to morality, and to justice. More than all perhaps, we have laid the basis of a future intercourse with the Christian races on the shores of the Black Sea, by which we shall develop their commercial wealth, and by which they will mingle with our civilisation. These, then, are the prospects which promise at once a pecuniary compensation for the treasure, and a moral satisfaction for the blood, which have been poured out in vindication of the rights and interests of the East.

\* We have here taken the English "entering," or import table of ships from Turkey, for the year 1820—and have added the Turkish and Moldo-Wallachian exports to England for 1853. Both are given above.

- ART. II.—1. *History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen since the Reformation.* By the Rev. W. BROWN, M.D. Third Edition, 1854. Edinburgh and London, W. Blackwood.
2. *Cyclopædia of Missions.* By the Rev. H. NEWCOMB. 1856. New York, C. Scribner.
3. *Missions to the Heathen.* Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
4. *Church in the Colonies.* Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
5. *Colonial Church Chronicle.*
6. *Periodical Accounts of the Moravian Missions; Annales de la Propagation de la Foi; Reports of various Societies.*

AMONG the words of the same Divine Teacher, and in the same narrative of them, are contained, both an earnest exhortation to proselytize, and a denunciation, which sounds contemptuous of proselytism.\* Contrasts such as this are a characteristic of the Christian religion. Far from accounting these a weakness or reproach, it possesses few more convincing proofs of its truth, or surer pledges that it is to last for ever. In this very peculiarity consists, in a great degree, its superiority over the other religions of the world, and most of its own sects. Each of these seizes on truths singly, and develops them into action, unchecked by the necessary counterpoise by which each is, in its own nature, accompanied and controlled. The result of such a procedure is a course of religious efforts, vigorous and energetic even to the extreme of violence, but eccentric and ultimately self-destroying, such as we may imagine that of a planet in which *inertia* had overpowered gravitation. Christianity, on the other hand, presents her truths to us, in their own true nature and connexion, each checked and balanced by an opposite.

All this is remarkably true with respect to our present subject of missionary enterprise. Other religions have had, and still have, their missions. A zeal for religious proselytism, resting on the true principle that it is a duty to spare no pains to extend to others that divine truth with which we have been blessed ourselves, was the soul of Islam in its more vigorous days.† It is

---

\* Matt. xxviii. 19; xxiii. 15.

† It is very remarkable, that, effete as Mahometanism seems at its centre, it is still vigorous and advancing at its extremities. It is spreading southwards and westwards in Central Africa, both by the sword of the Filatas, and by more peaceful proselytism. It is even now a great obstacle to the missionaries on the western coast of that continent. The same is the case in the Sunda Islands. The missionaries in Sir James Brooke's dominions express fears of the Dyaks embracing it instead of Christianity. It is also sufficiently powerful in China to give M. Huc

also the inspiring spirit of the Roman form of Christianity. But, both in the Christian and the non-Christian sect, this true principle has been permitted to stand isolated; and their votaries have been encouraged to forget (except when they wish to apply it to an adversary) the opposite truth, that nothing is baser or more mischievous than mere proselytism. The missionary impulse of each is one, that has disdained to inquire, whether its spirit is one of pure or false zeal, and whether its mode of proceeding is always in strict conformity with the moral law. Hence, the history of these, as of most other proselytizing sects, has been a very chequered one. In each, we may read of acts of dauntless heroism and noblest self-denial. But these are balanced by enormous crimes, in which heroic and self-denying men are often found to have been the criminals. No wars have been more sanguinary or inhuman than religious wars, whether in Christianity or in Islam. No self-interest has ever produced so cold-blooded and calculating a cruelty as sincere unselfish religious persecution. No frauds or forgeries have been so cunningly devised or so perseveringly sustained, as those which have been practised, within the ranks of sacerdotal Christianity, by self-devoted men, in behalf of the law of love and the gospel of truth.

The error of the Protestant world has generally been a too exclusive acceptance of the opposite truth. The contemptuous denunciation of mere proselytism has been the word, to which its less enthusiastic spirit has listened most readily. A Protestant is, indeed, scarcely capable of that unreasoning zeal which animates the missions of the Roman Catholics. To him, an inconsiderate or unreserved devotion to any cause or institution upon earth seems, as indeed it is, idolatry. He knows that he ought to be guided by calm conscience rather than religious passion, and that the sense of duty must be more powerful in him than unreflecting love. There is something, therefore, in his heart, that bids him pause, before he ventures to join in the enterprise of compassing sea and land to make proselytes, and forces him to examine very jealously every detail of the work. Considerations of this kind have always had a tendency to check, in Protestants, the impetuosity of missionary zeal. Now, however, it is wonderfully awakened in every reformed section of the

an excuse for attributing the recent movement there to it, rather than to the Bibles and Tracts of "the Methodist Missionaries." The Mahometans of India have begun to conduct learned controversies with the Christians, and to print and circulate cheap editions, and even *Translations*, of the Koran, after the manner of the Bible Society. Dr. Allan, an American Missionary of twenty-five years' experience in India, thinks it very probable that Mahometanism may even yet spread widely in that country. Instances have been known of British Christians at the Cape of Good Hope embracing the religion of Mahomet through intercourse and inter-marriage with Malay Mussulmans settled in Cape Town.

Church : the circumstances of the times have added to it a controversial tone, which is not naturally its own : and some of us seem sometimes in danger of taking a leaf out of the book of our opponents, and letting our missionary zeal degenerate into mere proselytism.

A missionary labour free at once from both these evils would be a noble thing indeed. Imagine a grand evangelical effort, extended over the whole world, and everywhere disinterested, everywhere unsectarian—free, in its individual labourers and supporters, from all selfish pursuit of gain or distinction—emancipated from all unholy alliance with the schemes of secular politics, and enlightened to disclaim at last all blinding and imbittering religious zeal for an exclusive church, sect, or priesthood—everywhere seeking the good of the disciples only ! such a proselytism as this would be a noble spectacle indeed, and would win a very speedy victory. This ideal will be attained whenever the whole Christian body has learnt how to combine, in harmonious equipoise, these two opposite principles enunciated by its Divine Founder—zeal for man's conversion to truth and goodness, and contemptuous hatred of mere proselytism. The work of this present Article will be an humble attempt to feel our way towards this ideal.

The first of all our subjects for consideration—the object of missionary enterprise—has been much obscured by the exaggerated language in which advocates of the cause indulge. Both in Romish and Protestant missionary records, we may trace a notion, implied, though seldom nakedly expressed, that heathens, who fail to come, during their lifetime, within the range, in the one case, of the mystic grace of Christian sacraments, in the other, of the life-giving efficacy of Christian faith, actually perish. M. Huc, in a very curious passage of his work on *The Chinese Empire*, tells us, that “the Society of Holy Infancy, founded in Paris only a few years ago, has already, perhaps, *saved* in China a greater number of children than the immense revenues of all the hospitals of this vast empire.” As M. H. has elsewhere informed us, that the Foundling Hospitals of Peking receive all the children that their parents choose to abandon in that vast capital, and that there are similar institutions in all the provincial towns, one feels constrained to ask, with some surprise,—How can a small persecuted sect find a creditable apparatus sufficient to *save* the lives of a still larger number ? The explanation is, that their salvation is effected by a much easier process. In all the Buddhist countries, which contain Roman missions, large numbers of female devotees are employed, whose duty it is to introduce themselves into heathen families and secretly to baptize the children, whose lives seem to be in danger. This curious

kind of missionary labour is carried on to an almost incredible extent. In the Empire of Annam, where the Roman Catholic returns claim about 500,000 native Christians, 40,856 infants of heathens are said to have been baptized in a single year (1854). These children are *saved*, by this surreptitious sprinkling, from that bitter wrath of their Heavenly Father, to which their innocent souls would otherwise have fallen victims. The same idea appears in the following extract from an American Missionary Report, which has been quoted and deservedly chastised by Bishop Colenso in his pleasant and genial *Ten weeks in Natal*.

"Every hour, yea, every moment, they are dying, and dying, most of them, without any knowledge of the Saviour. On whom now rests the responsibility? If you fail to do all in your power to save them, will you stand at the judgment guiltless of their blood? Said a heathen child, after having embraced the Gospel, to the writer, 'How long have they had the Gospel in New England?' When told, she asked, with great earnestness, 'Why did they not come and tell us this before?' and then added, 'My mother died, and my father died, and my brother died, without the Gospel.' Here she was unable to restrain her emotions. But, at length, wiping away her tears, she asked, 'Where do you think they have gone?' I, too, could not refrain from weeping, and, turning to her, I inquired, 'Where do you think they have gone?' She hesitated a few moments, and then replied, with much emotion, 'I suppose they have gone down to the dark place—the dark place. Oh! why did they not tell us before?' It wrung my heart as she repeated the question, 'Why did they not tell us before?'"

Can this be mere *ad captandum* language, intended to draw contributions to the missionary societies? If so, it is very wicked. But if it be really genuine and sincere, how melancholy a fanaticism does it display! We shudder at the accounts of Devil-worship which come to us from so many mission-fields. We pity the dreary delusion of the Manichees, who enthroned the Evil Principle in heaven. But if we proclaim that God is indeed one, who could decree this more than Moloch sacrifice of the vast majority of his own creatures and children, for no fault or sin of theirs, we revive the error of the Manichee; for the God, whom we preach as a destroyer of the guiltless, can be no God of justice, far less a God of love. It needs not exaggerations such as these to supply a sufficient motive for missionary enterprises. Our object is to introduce Christianity with all the blessings that accompany it—its true views of God, its ennobling motives, its pure morality; the elevation of life and manners, the civilisation, the knowledge, even the material progress, which are sure to follow in its train. And we may leave it to God himself, to decide how the benefit of Christ will be ex-

tended to those whom it has pleased Him to permit to live and die in ignorance of His gospel; confident, that the same rule of perfect justice, tempered with boundless mercy, has one uniform application everywhere and to all.

We firmly believe that there is no page in Universal History, which contains the record of more truly noble deeds, than that on which is written the history of Christian Missions: yet we are not blind to their failings: and we think that the wiser plan, though the less enthusiastic, is to consider these first. The chief corrupting causes are a low worldly object, which may appear, either in the labourers themselves, or in their converts, or in their supporters; unnatural alliances with secular politics and diplomacy; and lastly, that blind imbittering sectarian spirit, which is the last temptation of devout and zealous minds. If we could eliminate these, our missionary enterprises would be pure.

The greatest stain and disgrace that can befall the cause, is that of gross personal selfishness on the part of the missionary. This is a fault that has often been laid at his door: nor can we venture to affirm that it has never appeared upon the mission field. But it has been a much rarer phenomenon than the enemies of the cause suppose. The missionary has always been remarkably liable to detraction. In the sphere in which he moves, he meets with two distinct currents of slander. One proceeds from those outcasts of society who congregate at the outposts of civilisation, where they can enjoy the luxuries of the civilized world, yet elude the strong grasp of its laws. These hate him cordially, because his whole life and labour rebuke their vices and cross their aims. Another still more melancholy one flows from the sectarian jealousy of his fellow-Christians, who compete with him for the possession of the heathen. Most of the charges of self-interested motives brought against missionaries, will be found to have proceeded from one or other of these sources. So far as we can judge, the first motive of a missionary is, in nearly every case, a pure, and often an enthusiastic one. But, though seldom wanting at the outset, true zeal has often disappeared in colder and less enthusiastic middle age. Of this there have been many examples. The Church of England missionaries, who ventured to settle in New Zealand, when its natives were only known as inveterate cannibals, were brave men, and bore nobly the burden and heat of the day. But when their victory was secured, many of them could not resist the tempting opportunity of founding large landed families, in the land which their own exertions had won for civilisation and Christianity. A similar temptation befell several of the Polynesian missionaries of the American Board and the London

Society. And it is to be feared, that wherever advantageous positions in a pleasant climate are presented as a reward of forsaking sacred duty, some hearts will be found too feebly nerved to resist the temptation. But these are the exceptions, not the rule. The servants of every missionary organization have met with sufficient loss and trial to prove their general sincerity. Expatriation is itself no small trial to the active energetic man who could carve out for himself a respectable career at home. Even the beautiful islands of the Western Ocean are no tempting residences to persons reared in the lap of civilisation; far less the ice-bound shores of Greenland or Labrador, the desolate oases of Damara and Namaqua-land,\* the sandy plains of Tinnevely, or the pestilential jungles of Sierra Leone,† The salaries given by the societies are, in some cases, very small, and seldom tempting ones; and opportunities of personal enrichment are too rare to form a part of the first view of the missionary.

But though these scandals are very rare, and daily becoming more uncommon, yet the knowledge that they do exist is a source of great weakness to the missionary cause. An evil or inconsistent act draws more attention than a whole life of quiet unobtrusive duty; and one Demas is enough to discredit many Pauls. The position of the missionary is so completely that of the city on a hill, open to the sight, and subject to the criticism, of all the world, that no pains should be spared to remove from it every occasion of offence.

There seem to be two ways in which offences may be removed. First, the example of the Church of Rome may be followed. She, as is well known, renders these acts of weakness very difficult and almost impossible, by taking from her missionary all

---

\* For an account of these mission stations, see *The Lake Ngami*, by C. T. Anderson. The stations lie along the edge of the river Swakop: their cultivable land is in the bed of that river, which is dry, except when an occasional thunder-storm floods it for a few hours, about every second or third year, sweeping the crops away. The missionaries receive supplies from the Cape once in two years, this being their only intercourse with the civilized world, unless visited by an occasional trader, or hunter of the Gordon Cumming kind. The people for whom they labour, "the Namaquas, possess every vice of savages, and none of their noble qualities. So long as they are fed and clothed, they are willing enough to congregate round the missionary, and to listen to his exhortation. The moment, however, the food and clothing are discontinued, their feigned attachment to his person and to his doctrines is at an end, and they do not scruple to treat their benefactor with ingratitude and load him with abuse." The missionaries in this case are of the Rhenish Society from Barmen.

† In the first twelve years of the Church Missionary Society's labours in Western Africa, thirty persons connected with the mission died. This mortality is surpassed by that among the missionaries of the Basle Society in Liberia. Between 1827 and 1842, they sent thither seventeen persons: of these, ten died within a year of their landing, two more in less than three years, and three returned in broken health. This martyrdom by disease should be honoured the most, for it draws no attention, and obtains no glory.

personal property, and breaking every tie of family relationship and individual love. At the same time, she trains from his earliest years\* the person, who is to submit to these privations; and the system, to which she attaches him, surrounds him with overseers, who complete the safeguard and restraint. She succeeds, for the most part, in killing individual self-interest: the sect receives the affections that would have belonged to the wife and children: and the sect-interests become the object of all that is still worldly in the mind. But there are special temptations in the way of these tie-less men. The love of sect is quite as selfish a passion, as that of wife and children: and too great devotion to the interests of sect is as worldly, and, in truth, much more ensnaring, than the same devotion to those of a family. When everything else has been resigned, sect becomes self; and its interests are pursued, as those of the personal self seldom are, without any check from conscience. Hence is formed that remarkable compound character which we find in the Roman missionary. He devotes all his interests to his sect, and deifies it. To him, so far as he has reached the point at which his training aims, self, sect, and God are one. He serves with a scarcely rivalled self-devotion that sect, in whose service he finds his own affections gratified, and whose cause he identifies with that of God: but at the same time he hates with the true priest's hatred all who attack it, or dispute its claims; since he loves it as self, and worships it as God, and it is to him his all. The character of the Roman missionary is a marvellous compound of zeal and uncharitableness.

We believe that a better remedy may be found in the system of the Moravian brethren. No charge of personal self-interest has ever been brought against them, although most of their missionaries are married men; and there has never been a body of Christians, in whom the opposite fault of sectarian zeal has been so entirely absent. Their settlements are called missionary families, and appear thoroughly to deserve the name. The brethren labour, and even engage in trade, but only for the brotherhood. They are thus entirely shielded from the danger of personal ambition or covetousness; and, to free them from all care and anxiety for their children, the society assumes their guardianship. The result has been, that their missions have always been the scenes of a quiet, humble, unobtrusive heroism, and have realized, as far as is possible on earth, the names that they so love to give to them, Valleys of grace, Tents of peace, Pilgrims' resting-places.† We think that something of this kind

\* We learn from the Report of the Maynooth Commissioners, that the special education of the French priest begins at twelve years old.

† Genadendal, Friedenhiitten, Pilgerruhe.

should be attempted in all Protestant missions. In cases, where there is great danger to be encountered, or the life is one of very frequent motion, the missionary should be, like Paul or Swartz, a single man. But, wherever the mission takes the form of quiet stationary duties, let the missionary's heart be softened by domestic life; and let the society to which he belongs assume the guardianship of his children. Let it be made clear, at the outset, that his employers take charge both of him and his, and that all pursuit of gain, either for himself or for them, is strictly forbidden him.

Self-interest corrupts the motive of the convert more often than that of the missionary. We fear that the total absence of it can only be looked for in an Utopia. In every account of a successful mission, which is written in an open candid tone, the feebleness of the converts, and the mixed nature of their motives is confessed. We do not mean that there is a conscious calculation in every mind, whether godliness is, or is not, worldly gain: but, generally, the convert feels, that his whole condition and position in life is raised by becoming a Christian. The arts of civilized life, education, knowledge, peace, protection, security of property, and wealth, generally follow in the track of the missionary. Association with Europeans is in itself an honour. The hope of these cannot but have their influence. In every country, the men of deep and intelligent conviction are individuals; while the masses act upon a general preference, composed partly of conviction, partly of lower motives, inclination, and interest. This was as much the case in the apostolic age as now. Even then, to the bulk of the converts, gathered as they were from among the poor, the material relief afforded by their richer brethren's charity was a certain good; while persecution was a distant and not very probable evil. The numbers of that earliest and purest Church were largely swelled, by widows, who received from it their daily sustenance, and murmured when they thought their claims neglected, and by rich hypocrites like Ananias, who found it worth while to bid high for influence in so rising a community. The New Zealanders, the islanders of Polynesia, the low caste men in Southern India, are all more or less attracted to the gospel, by the superiority which they observe in the general condition of Christians. Nor do we find the case different in the Roman missions, whenever we can catch a sight of their real condition, beneath that veil of rose-colour in which they are pleased to dress them.\* M. Huc speaks candidly, and

---

\* "I do not remember any one (out of between 200 and 300 converts) who may be said to have embraced Christianity from conviction and from quite disinterested motives."—Abbé Dubois, quoted by Dr Allan, *India, Ancient and Modern*. Mr. Caldwell, of the S.P.G., makes a very similar admission, with respect to Church of England missions in South India.

therefore very humbly, of his Chinese converts; and acknowledges, that most of them were made, at the time when the Jesuits enjoyed the favour of the imperial court, and that, since that time, Christianity, though now become hereditary, has been stationary or even retrograde. Gross cases of direct bribery, we believe, seldom occur: and only when rival Christian sects are engaged in a base competition for the possession of the same proselytes. In the last accounts from Feejee, the Wesleyan missionaries complain bitterly, that the Romish missionaries are winning away their converts, by dispensing to them medicines gratis,—an easy charity while their numbers are but small; whereas they themselves having the charge of large communities, who swallow calomel by the pound, and salts by the hundred-weight, are obliged to demand payment. In the Holy Land—the inappropriate scene where all that is vilest and most corrupt in Christianity seems to meet, as if to teach us that our religion is not a local one—whole communities are said to be ready to yield themselves to the highest bidder, and to be willing to profess themselves Greeks or Latins, English Episcopalians or American Congregationalists, whichever will make it most worth their while. These things can only tend to the ultimate disgrace and ruin of all religion. We trust and think that they are rare.

But there is another corruption of missionary exertions which most affects the promoters of the cause at home. It is found by practical men, such as the managers of these societies no doubt are, that it is very difficult to raise a sufficient sum to carry on their operations, as a pure free gift; self-interested motives must be appealed to, or contributions will fall short. The *quid pro quo*, which the Roman Catholic offers, is an indulgence. When the Lyons Society, the chief organization in the Roman Catholic world for raising missionary funds, was founded, Pius VII. “lavished upon it these treasures.” The succeeding pontiffs were not backward in conferring new favours on its members; but all have been surpassed by the present Pope. “The constant anxiety of the blessed Pius IX. for our work,” say the present directors of the Lyons Society, “seems to have made it a task, to lay down an indulgence, on every spot where a special encouragement was yet wanting.”\* His last step has been to make children, who contribute to the institution while too young to receive the sacrament, capable of receiving all the indulgences, which were hitherto confined to communicants. Zealous members of the Lyons Society are encouraged to make contributions in the name of their children, and so obtain indul-

gences for them, as soon as born. It is fortunate for these lavish pontiffs, that none of those who receive these drafts upon the treasury of the unseen world, return to tell us whether they are all paid upon delivery; otherwise chronic bankruptcy might long ago have reigned, in the celestial, as in the terrestrial, provinces of the Pope's three kingdoms. Whatever a devout believer in the efficacy of an indulgence may suppose that something—so very definite as to be measurable by hours, and days, and years—to which these spiritual assignâts entitle him, to be, it is, at any rate, a something, not procurable except by payment, to which his missionary contribution entitles him. It is a *quid pro quo*. It spoils the disinterestedness of the offering.

We wish that we could say, that we ourselves are guiltless of kindred appeals to the baser motives of mankind. We do not presume to promise our contributors payment in full in another world, for the money that they contribute here. But we offer them an equivalent in this world. We furnish them with distinction and notoriety, and ample means for glorifying themselves. Thus we pay them, not, like the Pope, in paper, but, like honest tradesmen, in ready money. We give an unnecessary and very expensive prominence to the names of our subscribers, and so encourage Pharisaism; nay, we infuse the evil spirit of religious self-display even into our children, and give them the very debasing taste for seeing their charitable gifts in print. It would be a good deed if some of our missionary societies would remind Master John Smith and Miss Matilda Jones, the contents of whose money boxes are chronicled in the annual report, that those reports are the veritable street-corners of the nineteenth century, and that the self-display of modern Pharisaism transcends that of its elder sister, in the proportion, in which the publicity of a work of 10,000 or 20,000 copies surpasses that of a village thoroughfare. Nor can we find much to admire in our great public meetings. They are often nothing but a snare to the actors, and a delusion to the audience. What self-display, what rapid oratory, what exaggerated statements, what distorted facts are considered allowable in these assemblies of men associated together for the propagation of the truth! There are however many exceptions. Of Dr. Duff's addresses now before us, the two last were delivered before public meetings. They are just what addresses ought to be—clear and forcible expositions of facts and plans. Perhaps, even they are slightly tinged, here and there, with rhetorical wordiness, as from a man who might have become a wordy rhetorician, had not his earnest purpose of heart made him a real worker instead. But every one who reads them can see, that, if he ever affects eloquence, it is only for his work's sake, to which his words are never more

than handmaids. Oratory is with him, as it ever ought to be, an instrument and not an end. Perhaps the real reason why missionary meetings have so little effect is, that, of those who address them, so few are really at work in the cause. When a man labours upon any object daily, and has his whole heart in its success, a very moderate power of expression expands into eloquence. The most effective speakers, on missionary subjects, that we ever remember to have heard, are the Bishop of New Zealand and Mr. Dallas of the Irish Church Missions, of whom neither are at all eloquent, but both are in earnest and at work. If it were required of every speaker at a meeting, that he should be not only a speaker but also a worker in the cause, Exeter Hall, and all such meeting-places, might have fewer orators and shorter meetings, but their influence in the country would be infinitely increased.

A second corrupting cause exists when the aim of the whole enterprise is modified by the combination of a political object with the simple religious one. Christian missions have prepared and secured the conquests of many Christian potentates from Charlemagne, or even Clovis, downwards. Spain, Portugal, and even Holland, have found useful soldiers in their missionaries. The only power now remaining, that makes use of them for political objects, is France. We are standing, at this moment, in curious circumstances of close alliance, with the nation, whose present state, and real aims, and traditional policy, are most opposite to our own. We, zealots for civil liberty, stand embracing, with a grand flourish of fraternization, the nation that discredited it by its excesses, and then throw it away as a spoilt child might a plaything of a few days old, and cheering, as our most faithful ally, from Dover even unto Aberdeen, the despot who, for his own selfish ends, trode it under foot. We, zealots for religious liberty, have united our forces with the only vigorous nation, which lends its strength to the support of the now decrepit spiritual despotism. The situation is a curious one, and seems unlikely to be very durable. There can be no doubt of the fact, that, everywhere throughout the world, the cause of Roman and French power work together. In Syria, in Mesopotamia, and in every part of the Turkish and Persian Empires, the extension of French influence and the Roman Catholic communion are co-extensive. Wherever members of the latter exist, the French consul assumes their patronage and protection. The external conversions, which have frequently taken place, of whole Armenian and Chaldean communities into Roman ones, have had no other object, than to obtain the restlessly active succour of the French consuls, against the oppression and misrule of their Ottoman governors and neighbours. Nor is this politico-reli-

gious propaganda confined to any region of the world. The most unworthy page, in the history of modern Roman missions, has been their introduction of the bitter element of religious differences, into the successful Protestant mission field of Polynesia, where there was plenty of fresh ground for them to break up, among the yet untouched heathen. In this work, the missionaries have been supported at every step by French ships of war; and they requite the assistance which they receive, by preparing the natives for incorporation into that colonial empire, which, in spite of the natural expansion of the Anglo-Saxon race now established on every side, France still hopes to found in the Pacific Ocean. Many zealots in the missionary cause have felt displeased, that political influence has never been exerted by England in support of her missions: we think that she has acted wisely. Her missions are now the spontaneous growth of the Christian zeal of her own people: they are at once the witness and the stimulus of the life of her churches: they sustain, in British Christians' minds, the consciousness of the duty of personal sacrifices in the cause of religion. Nor has she ever contented herself with that bastard semi-heathen Christianity, which is always the first, and often the only, fruit of state-proselytism. Government aid to missions has been almost unknown in British possessions, until within the last few years. Very lately, it has been attempted in New Zealand, where the Government has furnished the heads of religious bodies with the means of supporting industrial schools; at the Cape of Good Hope, where the present Governor hopes that missionary influence may prove the means of preventing another Caffre war; and in India, where large assistance is offered to the educational establishments of the Missions. These are doubtful and hazardous experiments: we trust that the hopes entertained by their promoters may not be disappointed.

A third corrupting and lowering motive, which mixes itself with the true unselfish spirit of the Christian missionary, is zeal for sect—the distinguishing feature of the ancient Pharisee. We have already slightly touched on this, when speaking of self-interest, to which, while it seems to be the opposite, it is in fact the most closely allied. No religious body is free from it: and of all motives that spur mankind to action, it is probably the strongest. Unlike gross self-interest, it seizes on the noblest as well as the lowest minds; and it moves unchecked by conscience, because, while it is a selfishness, it seems not to be one. It would be difficult to analyze the various ties, which bind a man so strongly to his sect. Their strength by no means depends on the intrinsic truth or goodness of its doctrines. It is probably greatest, when the sect can present an object to every

affection or desire within man's heart, the evil as well as the good. A religion that could contain at the same time a gross idolatry for the ignorant, and a pure monotheism, or, perhaps, a mystic pantheism for more enlightened minds, which could teach at once a pure morality for the pure, and provide an easy routine of formal duties, with ready periodical absolution of all offences, for the gross and carnal—such, perhaps, would be the religion that would attach to itself most hearts, and bind them with the strongest tie. This sectarian zeal has both its good and its evil side. It inspires a heroic courage, yet always courage for sect, and for goodness, only to the extent which the sect teaches it, or in the forms in which it lives and moves within the sect: for all that is good and noble beyond the sect's limits, it has neither eye nor ear nor feeling. It produces great self-denial—denial of the individual self;—yet always in the interest of the corporate one. It cannot rise to scrutinize the pretensions of that sect, round which all the affections have been taught to gather, and which, at the fullest development of the principle, fills to it the place of home and country, of father and mother, of wife and children, of conscience and of God. Far be it from us to deny the bravery and self-denial, which have been displayed by men who have given up their hearts' whole love and devotion to their sect: yet must we pronounce it an idolatry.

We have marshalled a formidable array of defects along with the excellencies of the missionary spirit and labour. We must now seek to find both the good and evil, as developed in existing missions.

Those that have spread over the widest surface, and have been promoted by the most diversified means, have been those of the Church of Rome. The work of Dr. Brown professes to give no account of these. He alleges, as one of the reasons for this omission, the impossibility that would often occur, of distinguishing between truth and falsehood in the narrations of the missionaries. The quotation\* by which he justifies this assertion, certainly establishes the impossibility, in many cases, of receiving their statements if uncorroborated. This is one of the cases in which the Church of Rome suffers, and must suffer to her latest hour, for her own admission of the principle that expediency in

---

\* "It seems," says M. Cerri, Secretary to the congregation *de Propagandâ Fide*, in a Report which he gave of the state of the Roman Catholic religion throughout the world to Pope Innocent XI., in the latter part of the seventeenth century—"It seems to be the constant opinion of all the members of the congregation, that little credit is to be given to the relations, letters, and solicitations that come from the Missionaries. Hence it is, that the usual answer of the congregation consists only of asking further information, which often proves of no use," &c. &c. Account of the state of the Roman Catholic Religion throughout the world, written for the use of Pope Innocent XI., by Monsignor Cerri, Secretary of the congregation *de Propagandâ Fide*.—London, 1715. P. 182.

some cases justifies a lie. But there are other authorities in existence besides her own servants: nor is it impossible to extract a certain amount of probable truth from reports in many respects untrustworthy. At any rate, her operations have been too wide, and the effects of them too important to be ignored.

Her great organization for collecting funds for Foreign Missions is the Lyons Society for propagating the Faith. The balance-sheet of this Society, which we print below, will furnish a tolerably complete chart of her present operations. We have somewhat changed the arrangement of the countries; and, in order that the sums of money named may be compared more readily with those of Protestant societies, we have exchanged francs for sovereigns, at the liberal rate of one of the latter for twenty-five of the former.

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
France, . . . . .	£38,200	British Islands—	
British Islands—		England, . . . . .	£6535
England, . . . . .	£1386	Scotland, . . . . .	2880
Scotland, . . . . .	60	Ireland, . . . . .	2825
Ireland, . . . . .	4800		£12,240
	6,246		
Belgium, . . . . .	8,142	North of Europe, . . . . .	800
Holland, . . . . .	3,213	} Germany, . . . . .	7,240
North of Europe, . . . . .	34		
Germany, . . . . .	738		
Prussia, . . . . .	9,185	Switzerland, . . . . .	1,984
Switzerland, . . . . .	1,237		
Italy—			
Lombardo-Venetian			
Kingdom, . . . . .	£3772		
Modena, . . . . .	652		
Papal States, . . . . .	2961		
Parma, . . . . .	343		
Sardinian States, . . . . .	7339		
Two Sicilies, . . . . .	4972		
Tuscany, . . . . .	1597		
	21,636		
Spain, . . . . .	579		
Gibraltar, . . . . .	41		
Portugal, . . . . .	940		
Malta, . . . . .	655		
Ionian Islands, . . . . .	2		
Greece, . . . . .	39	European Turkey, Greece,	
		and Ionian Islands, . . . . .	9,149
		Asiatic Turkey, Syria, Me-	
		sopotamia, &c., . . . . .	11,537
		Persia, . . . . .	830
The Levant, . . . . .	162		
British India, . . . . .	157	British India, . . . . .	14,570
Mauritius, . . . . .	152	Ceylon, . . . . .	1,200
Birmah, . . . . .	8	Birmanah, . . . . .	1,284
		Siam, . . . . .	1,050
Cochin China, . . . . .	80	Annam, Cochin China, &c.,	5,650
Batavia, . . . . .	13	Malacca, Penang, Singapore,	
		&c., . . . . .	2,393

RECEIPTS.		PAYMENTS.	
Cape of Good Hope and St Helena, .£49		China, (including Corea, Loo-choo, &c.), . . .	£13,564
		Thibet, . . .	523
		Dutch East Indies, . . .	600
		Cape of Good Hope and Natal, . . .	2,400
		Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli, . . .	3,120
		Egypt, . . .	2,216
		Abyssinia, . . .	960
		Western Africa, . . .	2,000
		Madagasear, . . .	1,204
		Seychelles, . . .	200
		&c. &c., . . .	320
British North America, . . .	3,560	British North America, . . .	8,990
United States, . . .	2,267	United States, . . .	29,124
Mexico, . . .	63	West Indies, &c., . . .	4,140
Cuba, . . .	34	Australia, . . .	3,040
British and Dutch West Indies, . . .	52	New Zealand, . . .	1,820
South America, . . .	1,072	Polynesia—(Sandwich Islands, £2613; Tahiti, £2600,) . . .	11,858
Total, . . .	<u>£148,909</u>	Total, . . .	£155,015

The first point, that strikes us here, is that to which we have already once adverted, that the chief place in the van of Papal enterprise is held no longer by bigoted, unchanging Spain, or by retrograde Austria, but by free-thinking, progressive France. When Louis Napoleon declared the other day, that he was resolved to maintain that ancient title of the French kings, Eldest Son of the Church, he claimed no more than was by right his own. France furnishes nearly two-thirds of the funds for the Papal Propaganda; and if we examine the nominal return of missionaries, we shall find that she also furnishes a very large proportion of the men. Another point worth notice is, the proportion that aggressive missions against rival forms of Christianity bear, to those which are directed towards the heathen. To the former kind belong—all those whose sphere of action is in Protestant Europe, on which a sum of £21,517 a year appears to be expended—all those in the Turkish empire and in Persia, which make no attempts to convert the Mussulmans, supported at the annual cost (including Egypt and Abyssinia) of £24,742—while of the very large sum of £42,254, expended within the limits of America, a very small part is applied to the inconsiderable Indian Missions; the chief part is employed in an effort to retain within the obedience of Rome, those multitudes of Roman Catholic emigrants, whom the infectious example of Yankee freedom converts into emancipated and independent men. The £3040 expended in Australia is not devoted to missions to the heathen; and even the missionary enterprises in

New Zealand and Polynesia have been little more than attempts to disturb and tarnish the victories over heathenism already secured by the hands of others. We shall probably find that, of the funds intrusted to this great organization, about £60,000 are devoted to the actual heathen; and about £95,000 to various proselytizing and self-preserving agencies directed towards its promoters' fellow-Christians. It is a fact of great significance, that the large sum of £29,124, is spent within the limits of the wealthy United States; especially when this large sum is confronted with the extremely small contribution of £2267 collected in the same country, and when we discover, on further examination of the returns, that more than a third of this contribution (£884) is raised in the single diocese of Boston, no doubt from the Irish operatives in Lowell and other manufacturing towns.

Confining our attention to the work of the Roman Church among the actual heathen, we shall find, first, that the above table does not contain the names of her most ancient and most successful missions. These were within the limits of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, in which every influence of the secular government, not excepting force,\* was in operation for centuries in her favour. She has made the whole of these, including South America, Mexico, and a large portion of the Philippines, at least nominally Christian; and the fallen power of the Portuguese in India and Ceylon has left behind, in each of these countries, a large body of persons professing Christianity. Her once famous missions to the Indians of Brazil and Paraguay† have dwindled almost to nothing, since they lost the energetic superintendence of the Jesuits.

If we look beyond the limits of the colonies of European nations, we find that Rome has gained her greatest successes, in lands where the Buddhist religion prevails—China, India beyond the Ganges, Corea, and Japan. The striking resemblance between

---

\* We believe that, in every Spanish and Portuguese colony, the exercise of heathen worship was prohibited,—in many cases, under pain of death. The Inquisition was established in all the foreign settlements; and was as active there against heathenism, as it was at home against heresy.

† The official inventory of the property of these missions, at the time of their suppression, gives a good idea of the immense means that were once at the disposal of the Roman Church. The Jesuits possessed 30 missions in Paraguay, inhabited by 88,864 souls; 771,839 tame cattle; 99,078 horses and mares; 21,410 mules and asses; 230,976 sheep and goats; wild cattle innumerable. Besides these, they had establishments at most of the principal Spanish cities. Their warehouses, offices, college, &c., at Buenos Ayres, formed a building, so substantial as to be bomb-proof, and 144 yards square. Their property in Spanish South America is valued by Mr. Robertson at £5,641,000.—T. P. and W. P. Robertson. *Letters from Paraguay.*

the Buddhist system and her own has been remarked by her own missionaries. If a Buddhist nation were to become Roman Catholic, the only changes in external organization and ritual would be, the substitution of beautiful idols for hideous ones,—of a melodious though incomprehensible ritual, for one as incomprehensible, but very discordant,—of monks and nuns, well-disciplined, active, and possibly intriguing, for lax and apathetic ones,—of religious observances equally regular and formal, but with more meaning and spirit hid beneath the outward mechanism, for purely outward and mechanical ones—of a Pope Stork for a Pope Log, which appears to us the exactest description of the Dalai Lama. It seems strange, considering the energy and ability that have been employed, that this change has never actually taken place. We could contemplate the possibility of such a change even with satisfaction, could we divest ourselves of our knowledge—certain knowledge, unless all Church history lies—that every convert, gained by the Roman Church, is a fresh soldier enlisted against freedom, and that truth which must sooner or later be found side by side with freedom.

Of the real state of her converts she herself tells us very little. Her adversaries declare that they differ very little from the heathens. Charity prompts us to suspect this statement of exaggeration.\* Yet we cannot doubt that, in all the polytheistic nations, her Christianity must remain virtually a Polytheism. That nice boundary line between veneration and adoration, which is so often transgressed even by the educated European, is not likely to be observed very carefully by the pagan neophyte; and, for him at least, if not for all people everywhere, a religion that presents many objects of religious reverence, must necessarily be one of many gods. It is, we believe, admitted, that the Roman Church makes no effort for the intellectual advancement of her converts.† Where education exists already, she competes vigor-

---

\* In India, the Roman Catholics are allowed to retain the distinctions of caste. The following description of a Hindoo Christian festival is quoted by Dr. Allan from Abbé Dubois, a Roman Catholic missionary in India for more than thirty years:—"Their processions in the streets, always performed in the night-time, have indeed been to me at all times a subject of shame. Accompanied with hundreds of tomtoms (small drums), trumpets, and all the discordant noisy music of the country, with numberless torches and fireworks—the statue of the saint placed on a car, which is charged with garlands of flowers and other gaudy ornaments, according to the taste of the country—the car slowly dragged by a multitude shouting all along the march—the congregation surrounding the car, all in confusion, several among them dancing or playing with small sticks or with naked swords—some wrestling, some playing the fool, all shouting or conversing with each other, without any one exhibiting the least sign of respect or devotion."

† We have great pleasure in being able to quote an apparent exception. The Romish Bishop in Ceylon receives the following testimony from the Anglican Bishop of Colombo:—"He is earnest, I hear, in the work of education; admits the vernacular Bible into his schools; has cleared the images from his chapel;

ously for the possession of it. Hence she has many schools in China, where primary education is general; and no less than ninety in the Sandwich Islands, where her campaign is a controversial one against American Congregationalists. But in her Indian missions, which she has now possessed nearly three hundred years, she has not yet introduced a translation of the New Testament, nor done anything to promote Christian schools. In Paraguay the Jesuits taught the Indians to read and write, but never to advance beyond the mere elements; nor was there any danger in these accomplishments, as the missions were isolated from all the world, and no literature could penetrate there except their own. In these South American missions, we have the Roman system perfectly developed, such as might be expected everywhere, did it suffer no check from the other influences which the world contains. The ideal aimed at was to make the converts children in malice, yet to keep them children in understanding, passively submissive to the priest as their spiritual father, and expecting from his lips (in Ignatius Loyola's phrase) the *jussa Dei per superiorem*. They did become a harmless, patient, obedient race, with scrupulous conscience, dependent mind, and perfectly apathetic will. But the moment that the artificial seclusion, in which they lived, was broken, and they passed into the hands of less able and active spiritual guides, the work fell into decay, and has now almost entirely perished.

We have already drawn attention to the great virtue and the great vice of Roman missionaries—freedom from personal self-interest, their glory, and sectarian bitterness, their shame. The Protestant missionary never receives a good word from his Roman Catholic competitor: the greatest charity, that he can hope for, is to be (as by M. Huc) ignored entirely. With this sectarian jealousy, there is found occasionally a trace of a sort of old-maidish envy, at the thought of the possession by an adversary of that forbidden and forsworn domestic luxury—a wife. The tone of missionary priests becomes highly acidulated when these ladies are alluded to.\* This character, with its good and its evil side, is entirely the result of training. The Roman missionary *fit, non nascitur*. He is an artificial being, as much as a Janissary or a

---

and, in other respects, has shewn himself too much above the prejudices of his people to be very popular among either them or their priests."—*Visitation Journal*. But, even here, education was already flourishing in the hands of his opponents.

\* A Romish missionary in the Sandwich Islands boasts that his co-religionists have been more active than the Protestants in attending people sick of the small-pox. He accounts for the backwardness, which he attributes to his opponents by the following conjecture:—"Peut être aussi que leur pieuses compagnes ne voulaient pas que les habits de leurs révérends époux alassent toucher à ces plaies dégoûtantes dont les malades étaient couverts."—*Annales de la Prop. de la Foi*. Whether true or false, this is very vulgar, and very uncharitable.

Zouave, or (to quote an example from the softer sex) one of the King of Dahomey's Amazons. We do not mean to institute a comparison between the last-named ladies and the female Roman missionaries, although the African heroine is said to be very chaste, and the Roman one is sometimes very grim. We wish only to say, that each of these classes is the result of a well-calculated artificial training. That of the missionary begins everywhere early, in some countries at twelve years old : from that day forward, the qualities to be produced, courage, adroitness, veneration and love for Rome, and passive obedience in her hands, and a total absence of the smallest suspicion that anything can be true or good in the teaching of the heretic, are always kept in view. The situations which these men have to fill often demand extraordinary courage and equal adroitness ; and men are formed, in whom these qualities are admirably combined. In China, their work has been for many years confined to the visitation of scattered communities existing under the ban of the Government. It requires them to live in constant disguise. They do not venture on preaching, or on any public religious act ; nor even speak of religion to a stranger, unless sure of their man. The persecutions which they have suffered have most likely been exaggerated ; but the adventures of all have not been so agreeable as those of M. Huc and Gabet ; and some have suffered death even within the present generation. We doubt whether any training would communicate to an Englishman the necessary versatility and suppleness for such an employment as this. He would never reconcile his feelings to preaching the gospel in a yellow petticoat, a red sash, and two long pig-tails ; nor do we hear of those zealous Romish legionaries, the Irish priests, being employed on these delicate services. The foundations of the Church in the Sandwich Islands were indeed laid by an Irishman in disguise ; but then that disguise was national and appropriate—a sailor's blue shirt, large whiskers and beard, and a short black pipe. But blundering Hibernian zeal is not adapted for the delicate work in China, and that country has to be garrisoned by Frenchmen, Spaniards, and Italians.

With respect to the means which they use to effect their purposes, there is probably none conceivable, which has not been in its turn employed, from the highest good to the lowest evil. Perhaps the earthly power of the Roman Church depends most, on the wonderful facility, with which she can enlist the wicked as well as the good in her cause, and fight with all weapons, whether of hell or heaven. While the immediate followers of Xavier, pure, and fearless, and self-denying men, were devoting their lives to propagate her doctrines in India and elsewhere ;

the soldiers of the Duke of Alva, incarnate fiends, if ever there were such on earth, in lust, avarice, and cruelty, were promoting the same cause in the Netherlands; and were as distinctly owned and as highly honoured by the master whom they served. The contrast displayed in this instance may serve as a type of the whole warfare of the Church of Rome, and is found realized in every country where she has been permitted to act uncontrolled. It has been so in her missions. In these have been displayed self-denial, courage, zeal, perseverance of the noblest kind; yet also, allied with these, falsehood and forgery, when opportunity offered; oppression and persecution, whenever temporal governments have placed their sword at her command. Her present position is perhaps the happiest that she has ever held, since it permits her to develop the former and nobler class of qualities; while the greater publicity of modern times has checked her untruthfulness, and the weapon of force has been, for the most part, taken out of her hand. It would be wise in her supporters, if, instead of striving to restore her material power, they would strive to deliver her from it, as a thing which has always proved her greatest temptation, and the occasion of her most indelible disgraces.

It is not easy to calculate the number of the Romish converts. These seem unknown even to themselves, as the returns that they lay before their European supporters have the appearance of estimates, or even guesses. A Roman Catholic writer in the *Cyclopædia of Missions* rates the Chinese Christians at 400,000; M. Huc at double that number. The variation of the estimates is a sure proof of the absence of certain information. In the empire of Annam and the adjacent countries, the Vicar Apostolic claims a population of nearly 500,000. The adherents of the Church of Rome in Hindostan consist of the descendants of the Portuguese, who are numerous in each of the Presidencies, and retain their religion, although they have lost the manners, and, in a great measure, the colour of Europeans. To these must be added a certain number of people, of French origin, in Pondicherry and elsewhere; many Indo-Britons; the larger part of the ancient Syrian Church, whose union was partly negotiated, and partly enforced, in the time of the Portuguese, but who still retain their own original rites; and the descendants of the early native converts. The Roman authority in the *Cyclopædia* claims for his Church a total population of nearly 4,000,000; while in the recent work of Dr. Allan, an American Protestant missionary, who appeals to Roman Catholic authorities, their numbers are reduced to about 1,000,000. There are probably no means of testing the truth of these estimates or guesses. Mr. Caldwell, a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the

Gospel, estimates the Roman Catholics of the Madras Presidency at 850,000. The Abbé Dubois thinks that they have decreased both in numbers and intelligence in the last hundred years. From the missions of Polynesia the accounts are again estimates only; and we believe that we can give no clearer information than that they represent their own success to be very great, and their opponents declare it to be but small. In the Sandwich Islands, they say that they have in the whole baptized 23,000 persons,—and from that conclude that they possess 20,000 adherents. If many of these were baptisms *in articulo mortis*, such an estimate would be a very exaggerated one.

With two or three brilliant exceptions, Protestant missionary enterprises have been almost entirely the work of the last sixty or seventy years. The Dutch, it is true, from their first establishment in Ceylon and the Eastern Archipelago, followed the example of their Spanish and Portuguese predecessors, in promoting, by Government influence, a sort of regulation Christianity. In Ceylon, they made baptism the qualification for all offices; the converts, thus made, were naturally no more than nominal ones; and the prevalence of nominal Christianity, Protestant as well as Romish, has become an obstacle in the way of the real conversion of the natives of their possessions. Several efforts were made by the Puritan settlers in New England to propagate Christianity among the neighbouring Indians; but these efforts, although they called into notice many devoted men, amongst whom we may name Eliot and Brainerd, were not supported by any powerful organization, and their effects were ultimately small. The two great missionary movements of the eighteenth century were that of the Danes through their colonies in Southern India, and that of the Moravian brethren. The first of these was adorned by the venerable names of Swartz and Ziegenbalg, who originated the first successful Protestant mission in Hindostan. Unhappily, Danish missions, although an honourable page in Protestant church history, belong only to the past; missionary zeal seems for the present extinguished in the Danish Church, and the remains of its once flourishing missions in Southern India are now tended by two English Societies. The Moravians demand from us a fuller mention.

The name of the Moravian brotherhood must ever stand first in the list of missionary churches. It first rose to notice in an age when, throughout all Christendom, whether Roman or Protestant, zeal was at the coldest.\* The brethren began their work, at a moment when self-preservation might have been expected to occupy all their thoughts. They were a community

of labourers and artisans about 600 in number, and but lately settled as exiles in a foreign land. Yet, "in the short space of eight or nine years, they had sent missionaries to Greenland, to St. Thomas, to St. Croix, to Surinam, to Berbice, to the Indians of North America, to the negroes of South Carolina, to Lapland, to Tartary, to Guinea, to the Cape of Good Hope, and to the Island of Ceylon."\* Since then, they have pursued their work in unobtrusive obscurity, not shrinking from peril or suffering, yet never aspiring to the name of saints or heroes, neither boasting of themselves, nor deifying one another. They have risen, like the earliest Christians, and by the same course as they, above the very similar reproaches with which they were once assailed. It has been their happiness never to have possessed the tempting power of persecuting others; and they have shown freedom from all persecuting spirit, by never bringing a railing accusation, even against their bitterest enemies. At the present moment, no Christian body bears, in the public opinion of the world, or deserves, a more unblemished name. Their view of religion has been the most simply practical, as undogmatic as that of the earliest Church, and wonderfully free from the exclusive spirit of sect. We wish that all other missionary bodies would take their Periodical Accounts, as a model of simple language, charitable spirit, and total absence either of cant or of self-praise.

Their mode of introducing Christianity is by preaching, without a prelude of natural religion, the good news of the mission and death of Christ. They consider that they have now learned, from more than a century's experience, that this is the most effectual way of approaching uneducated savages, the class of heathens towards whom their efforts have been almost exclusively directed. Of their religious practices (and indeed of their whole manner of life) the great characteristic is extreme regularity, approaching sometimes to formalism. This point is objected to by Dr. Brown and others; but we imagine that it is a proof of wisdom. The cause of the strong hold that an idolatrous religion retains upon its votary, is, that it has prescribed the order of his daily life, and surrounded him with a multitude of superstitious practices, which he cannot discontinue without violating a second nature; it holds him not through his convictions, but his habits. We conceive, that the best way of weaning him from these, is, to substitute other practices, as regular, and it may be somewhat formal, yet, at the same time, free from superstition, which may hold him by a new chain of habit, and edify him, at the same time, by the spiritual lessons that they contain.

---

\* Dr. Brown.

Their labourers are usually men of humble origin, without much erudition. "The Brethren have," they say, "learned by experience that a good understanding, a friendly disposition, unfeigned humility, fervent zeal for the salvation of souls, and a heart inflamed with the love of Christ, are the best and most essential qualifications of a missionary. In general," they think, "the habits of a student are not so well calculated to form a person for the toils and hardships of missionary life as those of a mechanic." In these men of humble origin and education, they use every effort to maintain humility of mind. "They think it a great mistake, when missionaries are held up to public notice and admiration, and much praise is bestowed on their devotedness to the Lord, presenting them to the congregation as martyrs and confessors before they have even entered upon their labours. They rather advise them to be sent out quietly, recommended to the fervent prayers of the congregation, which is likewise most agreeable to their own feelings, if they are humble followers of Christ."\*

They seem, from their names, to be chiefly of German origin. And here we may remark, that while, in this and most other missionary bodies, England provides the chief part of the money, Germany proves more fertile in men. Protestant Germany, including German Switzerland, possesses at least five considerable societies, whose head-quarters are at Bremen, Barmen near Elberfeld, Berlin, Leipsic, and Basle. And her labourers are of the right kind, devout and self-denying men, with simpler habits and fewer wants, and, therefore, much cheaper missionaries than most English ones. A curious private enterprise, conducted by M. Gossner, once a Roman Catholic priest, has revived, in our days, the simple style and too confident improvidence, of the early Moravian missions. This pious, but rather eccentric man, sends out his labourers, without any definite promise of support, bidding them go out in faith, and labour with their own hands for the supply of their necessities. Unhappily, he has been so ignorant of physical geography as to send large bodies of them to India, a land in which it is fatal for a white man to labour in the fields; and the fate of some of his missions has been very tragical. The English Church Missionary Society raises nearly one-third of its European labourers from German Switzerland and Wurtemberg, nor is there any English society that does not raise many of its best recruits from German lands.

---

\* The Moravians have 68 missionary stations, 297 missionaries, including assistants, 71,060 converts and persons under instruction, of whom 19,810 are communicants. Yet the actual members of their unity do not exceed 12,000 in the whole of Europe, and 6000 in America.—(Mann's "Census of Religious Worship, 1851.") Church history knows of no other church so emphatically a missionary one.

The wealth of the Church of England, and the position that she holds, as the religious body, to which most influential and educated Englishmen belong, renders her relation to the missionary cause a matter of the first importance. Her share in the work has been a very small one, until the commencement of the present century: and even now her efforts hardly equal those of the various sects of which she is the mother. Three societies within her pale have, at different times, taken part in missionary enterprises. That for Promoting Christian Knowledge\* afforded much pecuniary assistance to the labours of Swartz and his companions, and after his death undertook the charge of his missionary establishments, which it finally (in 1825) transferred to the Society for Propagating the Gospel, by which they are still maintained. This second society, about coeval with that for Promoting Christian Knowledge,† has acted hitherto rather as an institution for maintaining and extending Episcopal institutions, than for propagating what we should, in strictness of speech, term the gospel; if this word still means, as originally, not a form of ecclesiastical government, but a message of good news. As the champion of a particular form of church government, the activity and success of this Society have been very great. Episcopal institutions seem to have somewhat the nature of an exotic, when planted amid the lusty life and independence of a young colony. They do not take root spontaneously, like those of the more democratic sects, which shrink from no consequence of the ancient Christian dictum, *Ubi tres, ibi ecclesia, licet laici*, and believe that, in every assembly of two or three Christians, the Church exists perfect and complete, with full power to organize a government and administer all its ordinances. Unlike these, Episcopacy seems to require a period of artificial culture before it becomes acclimatized: but, this process once completed, it becomes a vigorous and self-sustaining plant. Such has been the history of the Episcopal Church in the United States: which would, in all probability, never have survived its feeble period without the careful nursing of this Society. Encouraged by this first success, the Society is carrying on the same work, with still greater vigour, in the remaining British colonies. But, as our present subject is rather the encroachments of Christianity upon heathendom, than the comparative progress of any one of its forms or sections in lands\* already Christian, this Society furnishes but little matter for our consideration. It possesses and has extended the remains of Swartz's labours in Tanjore, and has supplied labourers to an unoccupied part of another society's mission field in Tinnevely:

\* Founded 1699.

† Founded 1701.

a good deal of its recent work seems full of promise, as in South Africa, and especially in Borneo: but up to the present moment it cannot point to any decided success of its own. Yet we think that greater missionary triumphs await it in the future. There has arisen, chiefly under its auspices, a species of ecclesiastical character, perfectly novel, and likely to have an important influence on missionary affairs. We mean the colonial bishop.

Whoever looks at a squat and steady-going Dutchman, as he exists amidst the damp air of his slimy polders, content with the narrow confinement and dull uniformity of his dykes and canals, would hardly believe that, when set down to contend with the lion and the elephant for boundless mountain and forest pastures, he would develop into a South-African Boer,—a son of Anak, quick of eye and hand, enterprising and lawless, a mighty hunter whether of wild beast or Kaffir. And whoever looks at an English prelate, at any step of his decorous course of somewhat purposeless routine, could hardly have supposed that the same material would be animated, by the fresh air, and free elbow-room, and stirring society, of a young colony, into a vigorous and energetic nomade, who can not only bear a journey, but find a home, in a yacht, or an ox-wagon, or a cariole. The Propagation Society, together with another organization which lives under the same roof with it, and is probably itself under a different name, may claim the credit of having operated this transformation.

Those selected for this office have generally been men not far past the golden decade of human life, vigorous yet not immature, old enough to have learnt forethought and caution, yet young enough to remember how to ride, and walk, and sail, and even swim. Most of them are, emphatically, English gentlemen, truthful, upright, and honourable. Nor are they wanting in deep religious principle, of the plain steady English type, scrupulously dutiful, though not fervently devout. The exclusive spirit and sacerdotal pretensions, which lower the tone and misdirect the energies of some of them, are faults which, we firmly believe, time will remove. They owe them chiefly to the circumstances of their age. The period at which several of the more distinguished among them left our shores, was that in which the high Anglo-Catholic party was at its zenith. Its great leader had not yet sprung the mine, which he had been driving, for so many years, under the hearts and consciences of promising youths, whom confiding parents trusted that he and his were training honestly, to serve the Church and country that gave him influence and bread. It was the golden age of yet unhumiliated Anglicanism, in which it seemed a natural and desirable state of things, tending much to ecclesiastical unity and good government, that happy England should be blest with a Pope in every one of her parishes. Self-confi-

dent young gentlemen of twenty-four years old were going down daily to country parishes, burning to reform the ritual on correct mediæval models, to dictate new religious practices to the older generation, including often their own fathers and mothers, and to claim implicit submission to their own apostolic words. A man accustomed to exercise papal prerogatives in a single parish, when he began to feel (if we may use, anachronistically, the last new-coined ecclesiastical phrase) the blood of the apostles stirring in his veins, naturally claimed equal or greater deference in the wider sphere of a diocese. Hence the prevailing fault of colonial bishops has been a tendency to despotism, which has sometimes carried them into unheard-of extremes. Thus the Bishop of Newfoundland (an apostolic man in the true sense of the word, who lives, in his cheerless, foggy diocese, a life of the noblest activity and self-denial) committed the unexampled extravagance, of refusing the sacraments of the Church, to every one, who failed to contribute a sum fixed by himself, to the Church funds. In several dioceses, the judicious latitude allowed by the English Church on the knotty point of the effects of baptism, is practically narrowed, so as to exclude all who do not hold the particular bishop's individual view. But diocesan assemblies will tend to repress these extravagances, if constituted, as, we should think, the free colonial spirit will require them to be, on a sufficiently popular basis; and if, in their constitutions, the fact be duly recognised, that a layman of moderate information, common sense, and serious mind, is, on the average, as capable as an ecclesiastic, of deciding any doctrinal question, that is not better left undecided,—or, rather, more capable, because he will, usually, approach it with less professional interest, fewer personal antipathies, less *odium theologicum*; and, therefore, with greater calmness, and a more impartial mind.

Their demeanour towards the Non-conformists, who possess flourishing missions in their dioceses, has been happily softened, by the fact which has met them almost everywhere, that all the mission work has been done by hands independent of themselves. They have, in many cases, landed in their dioceses overflowing with their own exclusive apostolicity; and they have found all around them apostolic work done and doing by (what their theory pronounces to be) schismatic hands;\* while to their own apostleship, except the dead letter of a correct episcopal genealogy,

\* Even New Zealand, though converted by the Church Missionary Society, is hardly an exception; for that society was, a few years ago, as completely banned by the party to which the High Church colonial bishops belong, as the London, or the Wesleyan.

they could produce no single seal. Hard, indeed, would be the bigotry, which could stand unmoved before a fact like this. Yet the process of yielding has been in many cases so slight as to be almost imperceptible. The Bishop of Cape Town writes, naïvely, and (being a thoroughly upright and honest man) with perfect candour, how, in all his progresses through that colony, the ministers of the twenty Christian bodies that are labouring there, meet him with every demonstration of Christian brotherhood, give him the use of their churches, attend his services, permit—nay, press him to harangue their neophytes; and how he, in return, accepts the accommodation that they offer him, but refuses to hear their sermons, or be present at their worship. Were this sort of conduct to continue, there would be danger of introducing disunion into the Protestant missionary field, on which there has hitherto been perfect harmony. The sure way of perpetuating disunion in the Christian world, is, to attach men's hearts to the accidents of Christianity, such as forms of government and ritual usages, rather than to its great essential,—the faith itself; and to lead them to reserve for sect and members of sect, that love, which they should bestow on the Church at large, and on every Christian brother. The line taken by many of the colonial bishops tends certainly to promote this evil. But, happily, the stubborn fact, to which we have already drawn attention, modifies, in almost every instance, their practice, if not their principles. They see, that it would be a ridiculous presumption, for him whose Church has neglected her call until the eleventh hour, to step in coolly, and exclude or condemn those, who, in supplying her lack of service, have borne the burden and heat of the day. Accordingly, all the bishops, whose dioceses are the scene of missionary labours, adopt gradually a humbler tone, and seem drawn, in spite of themselves, to soften asperities and modify exclusiveness, and so to approximate slowly towards that heartier co-operation and closer union, whose advent their vain hope of a victory for their exclusive views can neither prevent nor very long delay. We have thought it necessary to speak strongly on this defect, in men, who are, in all other respects, eminently good, and eminently useful. The high tone, and upright conduct, and refined manners, of these thorough Christian gentlemen, are the very qualities most needed, to give a pure and elevated tone, to the newly-formed societies, at the head of which they are placed. And while they kindle religious life and missionary zeal in their own communion, the same good influence spreads to those who are beyond their pale.

The great English missionary organizations all date from the same period. The Methodist missions commenced in 1786; the Baptist in 1792; those of the London Society in 1795, and

those of the Church Missionary Society in 1799. They have all been, exclusively, the work of British Christians of the Evangelical school, and may be looked upon as branches of one great movement. We shall take the last-named first, although the youngest, in order to conclude at once our notice of the Church of England.

On two, or perhaps three, of its mission-fields it has achieved very considerable success. The first is its original one, in Western Africa, which seems capable of indefinite extension, if duly qualified labourers can be procured. The recent voyage of Dr. Baikie, accompanied by the Rev. Samuel Crowther, a coloured missionary of this Society, has proved that a route into the centre of Africa is open by the course of the river Niger. The country is populous; the population is friendly, and peculiarly open to missionary effort, because, through dread of the slave-hunters, it is congregated in large towns of from 10,000 to 70,000 inhabitants. The climate, although still very unhealthy, is becoming, as it becomes better understood, less deadly to white men. The voyage of the *Pleiad* up the Niger, lasting four months, was effected without a single death on board; and several of the missionaries at Sierra-Leone have lived past middle-age. Sierra-Leone affords great facilities for forming native labourers. It is a sort of central depôt, where the British cruisers land and liberate their cargoes of captured Africans. These belong to various, and often distant, tribes, both of the coast and of the interior. After continuing for some time under the influence of the missionaries, and acquiring from them some knowledge of the Christian religion and the arts of civilized life, these liberated captives generally return to their own countries, carrying the knowledge of the Gospel with them. An institution of a high character has been for some time at work training native ministers from among the most promising converts; and it is to be hoped that it may prove an abundant source of native evangelists for Central Africa. The other great success of the Church Missionary Society is that which, assisted by the Wesleyan Methodists, it has achieved in New Zealand. Its missionaries landed there in 1814, and so great has been their success, that of 100,000 persons, of whom the native population is supposed to consist, Sir George Grey believes, that there are not more than 1000, who do not profess themselves Christians. In Tinnevely, we can hardly call the mission-field the conquest of this Society, because the seed was sown there by Swartz and his companions; but to its efforts is due the great extension which it has received of late years.

The Methodist Society has extended its labours over a very wide surface, and has developed upon that surface its own

characteristic virtues and failings. It has shewn its usual aptitude for giving scope to religious activity and multiplying lay labour, and its usual laxity in admitting members. The enthusiastic tone, that it encourages, fits it to provide a vent for the religious excitement, so natural to many half-savage nations. Its heathen congregations are large, but very fluctuating; and, by all accounts, they contain among their numbers more than the usual proportion of nominal Christians. Its missionaries have borne, in conjunction with those of the English Church, a large share in the successful labours of Western Africa and New Zealand, and have very successful missions in Polynesia. They are labouring also, with great effect, in Ceylon and Southern Africa.

The Baptist missionaries established the first British mission in Hindostan; and it is a melancholy fact in the history of our Indian empire, that the jealousy of Government compelled them to leave the British settlements, and fix their residence where it still continues, in the Danish settlement of Serampore. They have taken the lead in the literary department of missionary work, especially in translating Scripture. Their first translations, were too numerous and too hasty to be good; but they have served as a first step towards more accurate and finished versions, which, in foreign countries, even more than in our own, must be the result of frequent revisions, and the growth of time. They still possess the most active Christian press in the Bengal Presidency, and have done much towards founding a Bengalee Christian literature.\* The same appreciation of the influence of printed books characterizes also their brethren, the American Baptists, in the Burman empire and in Siam. But, besides these literary labours, the Baptist community possesses one of the most interesting and rapidly progressive of all our missions. The American Baptists have succeeded in raising the Karens, a degraded aboriginal race, inhabiting the forest country of Pegu and the Tanasserin provinces, not only to the knowledge of Christ, but to a very considerable degree of civili-

\* One of the great collateral benefits derived from missionary efforts is the cultivation of languages formerly neglected. At the beginning of the present century, Bengalee, the language of 35,000,000 in Bengal, was a patois without a literature. In 1821 it was considered a great thing that 20,000 volumes had been printed and sold to natives in the previous ten years. In 1853, 418,275 copies of 1400 works had been sold. Of these 507 were religious, of which 215 were Christian, 40 Mahometan, and the remaining 252 of different sects of the Brahminical religion. The American missionaries, in the Bombay Presidency, are quite at the head of the vernacular literature, publishing the periodicals, which are in the greatest demand, and books got up to the native taste, which are not only accepted as gifts, but also sell,

sation. In Siam there exists the very unusual phenomenon of Protestant missionaries very high in favour of the court.\*

To the London Society, supported chiefly by English congregationalists, belongs the honour of having furnished the first apostles to Polynesia; and the last blood that has been shed in those islands in the Christian cause, has been that of its missionaries, Williams and Harris. Nor has anything tended so powerfully to awaken interest in the cause, as the romantic accounts which the agents of this Society transmitted, of their own wonderful success in those beautiful islands. It possesses also successful missions in Western and Southern Africa, and in Hindostan; and had once a flourishing one, now destroyed by persecution, in Madagascar.

The missions of the Church of Scotland possess a peculiar character of their own. That Church, previous to its disruption, had (as we think, wisely) chosen one single sphere of action, and one single branch of missionary work, and directed all its energies to bringing that branch to the greatest possible perfection. Under the direction of Dr. Duff, one of the greatest names in the history of missions, it undertook the task of providing a high Christian education for the natives of the chief towns of India. The Disruption, that has since taken place, has had no other effect, in that part of the world, than that of multiplying by two the flourishing colleges which already existed. These are a very remarkable experiment, the result of which is as yet uncertain. The object contemplated is to raise up a class, out of which the future Christian teachers of India may proceed. The means employed is to give them, through the medium of the English language, a thorough Christian education, which they may afterwards impart in their own vernacular to their fellow-countrymen.† In this system European science acts, in a remarkable manner, as handmaid of the Christian religion. It

\* It is a curious illustration, of the difference between the procedure of Protestant and Romish missions, that, in the last Report of the American Baptist Board, the Missionaries in Siam express grave doubts, whether they can justify themselves, in making themselves useful to the king, by translating official documents, &c., instead of giving their whole time to preaching the gospel. A Jesuit would have had no doubts, that the connexion with royalty must be maintained at any price.

† The doubtful point in Dr. Duff's experiment is, whether men, who have not the thorough command of the English language, will afterwards condescend to the vernacular. "Too often they have the same contempt as the Brahmins have for the *profanum vulgus*. What have the converts from the English schools done towards enriching a native Christian literature? As all their instruction has been conveyed through the medium of English, they almost forget the use of their own language, as an instrument of conveying knowledge; it is regarded by them as a patois. The result of the experience of the American missionaries for thirty-five years in Ceylon bears out this statement."—*Rev. J. Long, in Church Missionary Intelligencer*, June 1856.

is the great agent in the destructive part of the mission work. In the Brahminical system, science and religion are so mingled in one great scheme, that both must stand or fall together. The destructive part of Dr. Duff's plan is, by the aid of European science, to demonstrate immediately the falsity of Brahminical science, and ultimately of Brahminical religion. Upon the ruins of the building thus overthrown, he attempts, by a thorough course of Christian evidence and doctrine, to build up a reasonable belief in Christianity. Apparently, the destructive process is surer than the constructive one. There are but few avowed converts; although, it is said, the intellectually convinced constitute the majority of those who receive this kind of education. We do not think this a well-founded objection to the system. People are but too fearful of destroying, because they cannot feel sure, whether they can substitute anything better, in the place of that which they have destroyed. So thousands, perhaps millions, of good people in the Roman Church dare not protest against the recent deification of a woman, because they dread the consequence of discrediting a system, so linked with the popular convictions, and so influential on moral practice. So, too, the impostures of the holy fire at Jerusalem, and of St. Januarius' blood, drag on from century to century, because the perpetrators dare not discontinue them; lest, along with the ancient superstition, the faith itself should fall. Thus, among those, who have lost their faith in the self-sustaining power of truth, there is no limit to the continuance of superstition. The older it is, the more does its overthrow seem dangerous. Whatever we believe or disbelieve, no one should part with this conviction, that the truth needs, for its support, no lie, either spoken, or acted, or acquiesced in. It is a plain duty to contradict, and destroy, to the utmost of our powers, every falsehood within our reach, even though we cannot see the consequences, or even if those consequences seem very alarming. If our powers are not equal to setting truth upon the throne, from which we have cast down an idol, we must content ourselves with the negative good, and leave the constructive process to the higher Power, which sways all the movements of the world. Moreover, all accounts agree that, in heathen countries where Christianity has entered, a constructive process is always going on insensibly by the side of the destructive one. A conviction is gradually formed, which, although not quite Christianity, is very closely allied to it, and is far above heathenism. The great fundamental truths of natural religion—the unity of God, His providential government, and man's responsibility to Him, pass insensibly into the popular language and belief. Some read these truths into the text of their ancient religions; or possibly find them there, for in many ca

they exist already. Some reject their ancient belief, and are content with these truths alone. But they exercise an elevating effect on all.

A pleasing feature, in the present state of the missionary world, is the assistance, that we are everywhere deriving, from our Protestant brethren in other lands. The Americans, doubly our brethren, both in religion and in blood, are affording us assistance even within the limits of our own colonial empire. The American Board of Foreign Missions, a confederacy of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, stands at the head of education, both male and female, in Ceylon, occupying in that island much the same position as the Scots have earned for themselves in the great Anglo-Indian cities. Three American organizations support fifty-one missionaries in Hindostan. We have already alluded to the successful labours of American Baptists within the limits of our new Burmese dominions. There are also twelve establishments of the same nation engaged in a very important work in Kaffirland; nor do we find in their reports any narrow national feeling, or jealousy of the advance of British power.\*

It is cheering to observe, in the action of these various bodies, their general mutual harmony. In the northern district of Ceylon, there is an old parochial division, instituted by the Dutch, who provided each parish with a church. These are occupied, parish by parish, by Wesleyans, Church missionaries, and Presbyterians of the American Board. The English bishop testifies, that they work together, "with little connexion but less collision, and with no unkindly or unchristian feelings." In other parts of the same island, where the several spheres of labour are less exactly circumscribed, the result is a certain amount of jealousy, in which the bishop probably bears his share. In Southern Africa, we have the testimony of Bishop Gray, the exclusive of exclusives, to the harmony of the twenty religious bodies existing there. "They act independently of each other without much mutual consultation or intercourse. There is ample room for all, and, so far as I am able to judge, a kindly and brotherly spirit prevails among them. But," continues the Bishop, "the fact, that there are not less than *twenty different religions* in South Africa, cannot but be a subject for anxious consideration to the thoughtful mind which looks forward to the future." Honest candour has here stated a fact, and narrow exclusiveness added a comment. If these twenty religious bodies looked on each other as different religions, each pretending to exclusive rights, the prospects of South Africa would certainly be alarming. Happily

\* The incomes of the Protestant Missionary Societies may be roughly estimated as follows: the English ones, £500,000; the American, 250,000; those of Germany, and other countries in Europe, £50,000.

such is not the case. Similar accounts reach us from other countries. Nor is separate action the only form in which harmonious labours are found possible. Mutual conference is becoming more and more frequent. In London, the secretaries of the missionary societies have held for many years a monthly meeting. We are not aware whether this is attended by the able secretary who has done so much for the Propagation Society. We hope so: for if a minister of Curzon Street Chapel, Mayfair, has really united, at a meeting for prayer and conference, with his brethren of Little Bethel or Ebenezer, we shall begin to look out for the millennium. In Calcutta, a similar meeting has long existed: and last year a council took place, which may be chronicled by some future Labb<sup>é</sup>, of Bengal missionaries of all persuasions, at which the venerable Bishop of Calcutta had the charity and courage to preside. Perhaps a day may come, when a church synod will meet, not, like all on record, since the apostolic one at Jerusalem, to obtain the triumph of some exclusive opinion, or the universal acceptance of some ecclesiastical institution, and concluding with a chorus of anathemas; but, after that more primitive example, to reconcile opposing parties by a liberal act of toleration, and to devise means, by which brethren may act in harmony without violating their consciences, and abandoning their sincere views of truth and well-tryed religious practices.

The degree of success obtained by Protestant missions is, we think, considering that their efforts were trifling until within the last sixty years, very encouraging. Wherever heathens have been brought into connexion with Christians in the dependent relation of slaves, they have been led to adopt their masters' religion. Thus, the liberated populations of the British West Indies are as Christian as any European peasantry. The same is the case with the slaves in the United States and elsewhere. The East Indian colonies of the Dutch contain a large number of nominal, but, we fear, only nominal Christians.\* Amboyna, for example, with 5000 inhabitants, is said to be entirely Christian. Celebes and the other Moluccas contain very large numbers who have, at least, professed Christianity under the direction of the Netherlands Society, and, to judge from the returns made by the missionaries, those numbers are very fast increasing. The Protestant missions in British India are said, by late returns, to contain about 22,000 communicant members, with probably about 130,000 professed Christians. In China, the work is yet in its infancy, and the communicants of the missions are num-

---

\* The following returns from Celebes seem to show, that converts are received with very little preparation. At Tondano, Mr. Reidel baptized in 1847, 356 adults and 270 children; in 1848, 440 adults and 223 children. At Langowang, Mr. Swartz baptized in 1848, 958 adults and 332 children.

bered as yet only by units and tens: all the societies together only claim a total of 361 communicants. In the Birmah, the American Baptists return 8000 communicant members, who would represent, according to the Indian scale, a population of nearly 50,000 professed Christians. In South Africa, the societies return 14,258 communicants, and in Western Africa, 13,151. In Polynesia, and New Zealand, the native Christians must amount to nearly 200,000. Considering that no force has anywhere been employed in favour of Protestant missions, and that, with the exception of some of the Dutch possessions, government influence has never given them much assistance, and, in the case of British India, has, until lately, perseveringly opposed them, we think that these results are as great as could be expected.

We attach no slight importance to the fact, that the success of missionary enterprises has been so variously distributed. Episcopalians have been permitted to plant Christianity at the head quarters of the African slave-trade, and to raise up a new Christian nation in New Zealand. Presbyterians, Independents, and Methodists, are the founders of the Christianity of Polynesia. Scottish Presbyterians stand, in company with American Congregationalists and Presbyterians, at the head of the highest kind of intellectual education in India. One of the most successful and interesting missions belongs to the Baptists, who have also taken the lead in forming vernacular literatures. While the highest place in missionary honour must be reserved for the Episcopal Moravian Brotherhood, who, while they have made themselves an apostolic history, have, as our High Church friends inform us, neglected to continue, in its due channel, the apostolic succession. Yet, if outward or inward symptoms be any sign, that men have been inoculated with the true primitive virus;—if the “signs of an apostle” be “much patience,” and whatever may remain to modern times of “signs, wonders, and mighty deeds”—great evils conquered—ancient and strong idolatries overthrown;—if the best credential, that an apostle can produce, be, not a laborious historical argument, purporting to prove (what never can be proved) that the ceremonies were all duly performed at the ordination of every one of his predecessors; but “an epistle, that may be known and read of all men,” because written legibly, on the converted heart and amended life of an existing people, and signed and sealed by Him, without whose Spirit no such work can prosper;—surely each one of the Christian bodies above named may claim for their leading teachers a drop or two of that precious fluid, which (according to the Bishop of Salisbury) enters so largely into the organization of himself and other English bishops. Human nature clings to its narrow exclusiveness, and will not confess how base and contemptible it is; but

the hand of Providence rebukes its narrowness, by a more impartial distribution of success.

We should be glad, if we could either frame ourselves, or present to our readers, a prophetic view, of the next fifty years in the history of Christian missions; but, not possessing either second sight, or the Urim and Thummim of Mr. Brigham Young, or the self-confidence of Dr. Cumming, we will not attempt to lift the veil. Yet will we venture to propose a question or two, for discussion in the London Prophetic Society. Will the new false doctrine of the Church of Rome, which she has not embraced, like earlier ones, in undoubting faith, but has swallowed between doubt and unbelief, prove to her a pill of strychnine, by which, after a certain time for its operation, her existence, as a Church pretending to infallibility, will cease, and the piety and energy, of which there is so much within her, especially in her missions, be set free from its present bondage to her grand schemes of power, and be allowed to range itself on the side of truth and freedom? Or will she yet be able to attempt and attain a new lease of power, though no longer claiming it as the religion of faith, but as the best possible organization of unbelief, in which sceptics may be assisted to simulate faith, until, at last, they fancy that they believe? And will the English Episcopal Church see her mission to be the head, and support, and example, of many Protestant communities, differing in organization, and perfectly free; yet united, in a more perfect and higher unity, than mere similarity of organization can produce: or will she rather, by a feeble and narrow-minded attempt to reduce them all under her sway, put herself forward as a little—a very little Rome, trying to impose her shibboleths, and failing? Is there not hope that she will soften down her asperities, and repent of her exclusiveness—an exclusiveness, at the bottom, rather aristocratic than ecclesiastical—and join her brethren and children of the other Protestant bodies, in recognising each other, as no antagonistic religions, but only slight modifications of the same, differing no more one from another, than leaf from leaf, or cluster from cluster, on one parent vine? Is a time ever to come, when it will no longer be thought a high ecclesiastical virtue, to be most positive of those opinions, of which we know the evidence to be feeblest? Will the power and predominance of sect ever cease to be, even to pure and noble minds, a much more attractive thing, than the mere progress of truth and goodness, not chained to form, or identified with sect? And if these improvements do take place, and the cause of Christian missions do thereby become a perfectly pure cause, will men's hearts be found unsecular and unselfish enough to act and suffer for it? or, with rivalry, and ambition, and the excitement of proselytism, will the whole charm of the cause be gone?

- ART. III.—1. *Madame de Longueville.* Par M. COUSIN.  
 2. *Etude sur les Femmes Illustres du XVII<sup>me</sup> Siecle.* Par M. COUSIN.  
 3. *Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien.* Par M. COUSIN.  
 4. *Madame de Hautefort.* Par M. COUSIN.  
 5. *Jacqueline Pascal.* Par M. COUSIN.

THERE can be no doubt, that whoever studies the recent manifestations of the character of our time, must be forcibly struck by the contradictory tendencies visible in the two nations at the head of European civilisation,—England and France. For the last quarter of a century, we have in this country been tending, slowly, fitfully, in a measure unconsciously, but withal constantly, towards a clearer notion and a completer possession of truth, both in the domain of art, and in the higher spheres of morals, politics, and religious belief. Ardent and impatient lovers of the True may be so impressed with the slightness of the advance we have made, as to be inclined to deny the fact of our having made any progress at all. In view of the vast amount of conventionality still subsisting, they may refuse to make much account of what has been overthrown; but minds of this kind are wedded to excess, and their war-cry is, "All or nothing." We are progressing towards Truth; and we are, besides, learning to shake off that species of superstitious dread which has heretofore trammelled so many minds that God had formed for greatness. This is what we must recognise as the tendency of Britain in these times. This has not been, and is not the case in France. It is certain that the aim of the present century, in that country, has been neither knowledge nor faith, but, on the contrary, enjoyment and gain. The tendencies of the age, in France, are not towards truth; although the tendencies of the few great spirits she has given to the age are definitely directed towards a universal notion of truth, and towards the application of that notion to the entire reconciliation of Reason and Faith, Knowledge and Belief. In France, but a very small number only of men, who stand alone and apart, have retained any conviction of the Almightyness of Truth, and of the absolute inseparability from it of the Beautiful and the Right.

It is here, moreover, we find the great and radical difference between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries in France, which it has latterly been often the fashion to compare. For the individuals of those centuries, however exalted in the sphere of intelligence, you may, if you take them separately, find parallels; be-

tween the mass of society at large and what constitutes the public and aggregate existence of a country,—between the two centuries, in short, no resemblance can be discovered. Taking the first fifty years of each, we find that nearly similar social conditions were the consequence of the *Ligue* on the one hand, and of the Revolution on the other, and that the modifications in the national character superinduced by the struggle for religious liberty under the Valois and Henri IV., were equal in importance, though unlike in form, to those resulting from the contest for political freedom and social equality under the unfortunate Louis XVI. Placing, then, the two epochs against each other, no analogy, we repeat, can be discerned between them, if we regard them as wholes. Superficial historical observers are fond of confounding one period with another, of mis-calling, for instance, the seventeenth century the “age of Louis XIV.,” and seeming virtuously shocked at its improprieties. We would, however, remark, *en passant*, that, in the first place, the “age of Louis XIV.” is the *décadence* of the seventeenth century, the lustre of which begins, in fact, to burn less purely with the first bad example set by the king (in 1662); and in the next, that far from the irregularities of the seventeenth century having been greater or more general than those of our age, the reverse is the truth. But this is, in every sense, a narrow foundation on which to build a judgment; for, if scrupulously examined, the sum of what we term individual vice or virtue will probably be discovered to be pretty nearly equal in all times and in all countries. With this question the historian proper has nothing to do. The point to be studied is, the public standard of morality, not the greater or less number of individuals who come up to it. Man’s weakness is the same everywhere, and we have not to consider the proportion in which he may or may not do what is right, but the distinction clearly made, and the confusion strictly avoided in the public mind, between the notions of right and wrong. Here then, we say, is the difference of the present time in France from that of the corresponding period of the seventeenth century. From the fall of Sully to the dawn of Colbert, through the reigns (for we must call them so) of Richelieu and Mazarin, the tone of public morality was elevated, whereas it has been unequivocally low from the days of the Directoire to our own. Under the influence of such minds as those of Pascal, Bossuet, Descartes, Corneille, whatever was little or mean became strange: honour, disinterestedness, and a deep reverence for things worthy to be revered, were the natural characteristics of the times. “In a great age,” says M. Cousin, “everything is great;” and the proof of this, in the first half of the seventeenth century, will be found in the fact, that the peculiar greatness of the

great men of France was then to the full as much the expression of the greatness of what surrounded, as of what was in themselves. They responded to the tone, they bore the impress of the age. Those of the present day do not. They stem the current of the time, they go against its tendencies. The remarkable men of every civilisation have invariably been placed in one of these two positions, out of which it is not possible to conceive intellectual elevation : either their age is great, and they are so themselves from sympathy with its greatness ; or the age is small-minded, and they alone are great, by setting counter to all its baseness. In either case there may be parity between the individuals, there can be none between their times. The greatness of the men of the seventeenth century in France is inseparable from the collective greatness of what surrounds them ; they are as much animated by the spirit of their age as they contribute to keep up its elevation ; whilst those men who, in the present day, are really great in France, are so from their irreconcilable antagonism to the spirit of their time, from their superiority to the universal corruption, from their unflinching resistance to the sordidness, the crookedness, and the falseness of their age. Protestation is the sign of their eminence. In proportion only as they protest, are they still, or have they been, great.

From the point of view we have here indicated, the history of the literature of France at the present day is a most interesting study, and surprisingly little known. The sweeping accusation of "immorality," brought indiscriminately against the whole body of writers in France, is simply a vulgar error, and applies only to those who have pandered to the low, false spirit of the age, who have gone with the stream, and been, in the end, carried away by it,—who have been essentially subservient, not sovereign spirits. The immorality of an age is usually complex, and is reflected in various shapes in the national literature. The chief characteristics of the immorality of our day in France, as reflected by a vast number of her writers, are twofold, and come under the heads of gold-worship and disorder. If we make out a list of all those whose names are most familiar to us, we shall find there are scarce any who do not serve either one or other of these two principles. Some serve both. Let it be, however, distinctly remarked that with the mere talent, *i.e.*, the mere exterior garb of language wherein intellectual conceptions are attired, we have nothing at present to do. Our object is to show the *tendencies* of intellect in France, to distinguish those who go with, from those who go against the age, and to mark the particular forms in which the national low-mindedness has come to manifest itself in the national tongue.

Beginning then with Victor Hugo and George Sand, we find that with talent, (that is, command of expression,) the existence of which cannot be denied, both are high priests of disorder. Both participate so far in the poet-nature, that neither is guilty of gold-worship in the slightest degree, but neither is capable of seeing the loveliness of right, neither is gifted with the "single eye" of the Evangelist. If you study every work of Madame Sand, from *Indiana* to *Maitre Favilla*, you will discover that lamentable want of the sense of order of which her fanous revolutionary *Bulletins*, under the short reign of Ledru Rollin, were the completest expression, and to which her own recently published *Memoirs* afford the fullest clue. And what we say of the authoress of *Jacques* applies equally to the author of *Marion Delorme*. Both have a perverted vision. To both, whatever is a rule, a law, is hateful, and seems ugly merely because it is a law, or a rule. Marriage to them is frightful because it implies an obligation, and the wisdom of these sages is founded upon the existence of rights without duties. Religion (of no matter what shade of Christianity) is repugnant because it necessitates humility. They seize not the grandeur of a creed, that, ascending from the finite to the Infinite, deduces to the satisfaction of reason the Creator from the creature. We have chosen to speak of these two first, because in their intense devotion to disorder they have no inconsiderable resemblance, and they are the poets of the school; Icarus-winged spirits, however, whose downward-tending flight bears them unceasingly through darkness towards some far-off planet they never reach.

If we turn to the other side, we find Balzac, Alexandre Dumas, Eugène Sue, with a host of small followers whom it would be superfluous and tedious to enumerate, and who, with no more sense of the beauty of order, of the charm of the fitting—*quod decus est*—than those above mentioned, add, to what in them is a negative quality, the active one of an insane love of gold. Wealth is their god; they believe in it, they bow down to it, and perform its bidding at every instant. We are perfectly aware that they decorate this with the fine-sounding name of an artist's love of the beautiful in things; but never were words more violently divested of their natural meaning. What these men delight to reproduce are the workings of wealth, and whatever in their books cannot be reduced to a daguerreotype-like descriptive talent, may be traced to the inspiration of the great metallic master. It would not be just to let this criticism apply to Balzac without restriction, and if it were our purpose to study the merits and demerits of that very remarkable observer and painter, we

should have a large meed of praise to award. The grand merit of Balzac is his power of portraiture; he is essentially an "observer" and a "painter,"—great as it is, *Eugénie Grandet* is but a portrait. Now, however minute, however skilful may be the delineation of outward and surrounding objects, it is never by such delineation alone that a writer can secure for himself influence or fame, beyond those which the gratified taste of the hour is ever ready to vouchsafe to him unboundedly, and, as it were, in compensation for posterity's neglect. Nothing lives that has not life; the life of art is the Ideal, and the Ideal is simply the individual's sense of the Infinite; consequently, the power of really impressing and guiding other men resides in the man's own individual self, and will not be secured by any amount of talent he may display in a delineation, be it ever so faithful, of exterior objects. Now Balzac may be said not to follow or believe in an Ideal. He believes in wealth as do the rest, confesses and proclaims the beauty of gold, and by his works conduces largely to the permanence of a habit so fatal in France to all social and political morality—to the habit of judging people by what they *have* rather than by what they *are*. It was, for instance, one of this famous writer's most famous axioms that "there were not in Paris above four hundred women worthy of the name, for," said he, "whoever lives higher than a first story may be a virtuous individual, an excellent housewife, anything you like, but cannot be a woman in the right sense of the word,—*c'est une ménagère peut-être, mais ce n'est pas une femme!*" It is the theory of this school, (and Balzac is at its head, because possessed of talent so immeasurably above the rest) to believe woman inseparable from wealth, incomplete without the accompaniments of luxury. Volumes would not suffice to describe the harm done by these principles, cynically advocated as they were, and we should be almost afraid to show how—with society prompting literature, and literature abetting society—when once the "vicious circle," as the French call it, was entered upon, the inability to appreciate right became a national defect, and wrong grew to lord it boldly, and be the ruler of the time. One immenso mistake must be rectified with regard to the notion formed of France by foreigners, because it leads to a total misapprehension of the French character; we allude to the mistake which affixes the reproach of licentiousness to the social morality of France. Nothing can be more erroneous. Licentiousness is not the national vice of France in the present age, it is the one prevailing vice neither of society nor of literature; it is neither the dominant nor the parent vice, but one incidental and indirect. The vice we have alluded to above as more powerful and prolific

than the love of disorder, is not the love of pleasure, but the desire of gain. Pleasure-worship is the weakness of a society used to wealth; it was the natural failing of the eighteenth century in France; gold-worship is the vice of a nation whose selfishness and vanity have been developed at the expense of its sense of dignity and of its pride. *To have*, has been for the last twenty years in France the verb expressive of the social activity of the country. To be rich, richer still, the richest possible, is the chief object of desire and ambition. Out of the various vices left by the French revolutionary excesses of 1793 to the French race, rapacity is unquestionably that which has brought in its train the greatest and most numerous evils. Enjoyment even is in the France of our age an object subordinate to gain, and is proved to be so by the fact that, unless in very rare exceptions, material satisfactions are foregone if their possession is only to be insured at a cost threatening damage to the possessing medium; in other words, money is held to be more precious for its own sake than for what it can procure. Men in France do not ruin themselves through the strength of passion, through imprudence, or prodigality, but by false calculations in the hope of gaining greater wealth.

If we were to turn from the writers of France to her artists, we should perhaps find the saying of Cousin, "*tout a son idéal*,"\* more frequently exemplified. The country that has, in painting, produced Ingres, may reasonably, by such a master, outweigh a century full of the manifestations of materialism. And if, from painting, we turn to music, we find men who, like Berlioz and Gounod for instance, derive their artistic existence only from the fact of their genuine and austere devotion to the Ideal. The rock upon which the vulgarly and falsely-termed idealists in art are supposed to split is obscurity or confusion. But there is here a misapplication of terms. Idealism in art is art itself, for without idealism art is not, and cannot be; but there is upon this point an undeniable tendency, in young and ardently-convinced spirits, wholly to sacrifice the particular to the universal, and, in the perpetual contemplation of the Ideal-Infinite, to lose the sense of its special and finite application, if we may so call it, to this art rather than to that. "Art is long," says Goethe; and it should be added that he only is really an artist who distinctly knows through what art the Ideal-Infinite speaks to his soul, otherwise he is a

\* "L'idéal, voilà l'échelle mystérieuse qui fait monter l'âme du fini, à l'infini; Il faut donc que l'artiste s'attache à représenter l'idéal."—(*Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien*; 3<sup>me</sup> leçon, p. 189.) These lines may be said to contain the whole secret of excellence in art.

mere dilettante, or he misuses his faculties and concentrates in one special channel the force which should have been turned wholly in another. It is to this cause we owe those artists of whom we are ready to say, if musicians, "how much better had they been theologians," or, if poets, "what a pity they were not architects!" This can only be the case when, as we have said, the particular is totally sacrificed to the universal, and the artist, uncertain of his vocation, is not distinctly aware of the special act through which the Ideal establishes a communication with him. "The first care of the artist must be," says Cousin, "to penetrate the hidden ideal of his subject, be it what it may, for his subject has an ideal;" but here we must observe that the master himself recommends no vague tendencies, no general aspirations towards the Ideal-Infinite, but, on the contrary, the intimate "penetration" of "the particular ideal," of one particular and definite "subject." The presence of the ideal is the inevitable condition of excellence in art; but art loses its distinctive attributes, and, in fact, ceases to be art, if the immediate link between the particular and the universal, the derivation of the one from the other, be not maintained.

We have been drawn into this digression from the strong impression we have of the great number of artists in France who are uncertain of their vocation; from the conviction we have nevertheless that there are in that country more artists than writers who recognise in "the Ideal that mysterious ladder which," as Cousin says, "leads the human soul upwards from the Finite to the Infinite;" but, above all, from our belief that in France has been produced the artist, whose inspiration has in our own age poured forth upon the human race the utmost amount of the Ideal it is capable of absorbing in art. We allude to Lamartine.

From this point of view, when considering the tendencies and the state of the national intellect in France, it is impossible not to advert to Lamartine, though, strictly speaking, as one of those who protest and do battle against the age, his action is a merely indirect one. Lamartine is never sufficiently convinced to dogmatize upon the right, as, to his eternal honour be it said, does Cousin; but his sense of the beautiful so completely absorbs every faculty in him, that through absolute beauty he attains to truth, and, only when imperfectly beautiful, are his inspirations imperfectly true.\* Lamartine is also singularly complete as an artist, for he has the intense consciousness of his particular vocation.

\* Let it be understood that we speak of Lamartine here as a poet only, and without any allusion whatever to his political career. We have exclusively to do with the author of the "*Méditations*," of the "*Harmonies*," and of some parts of "*Jocelyn*." We do not even take him into account as an orator or a prose-writer.

He is a poet; he is so in the widest and highest extension of the word, artistically taken; but he is so exclusively. He never fancies he hears the voice of the Ideal speak to him through the medium of any other art than his own. In so far as it is a benefit to mankind to distract it from its material interests and positive pre-occupations, Lamartine has been useful not to France alone, but to the human race; but this good, as we said before, he has done indirectly, not directly. He has never been a teacher, but he has contributed greatly to whatever spiritualism our age may boast of. It is impossible to conceal the fact, that Lamartine is the poet of this century with whom by far the greater part of mankind is familiar. Byron, immeasurably more popular and more lastingly so, in France than in our own country, or in any other, falls far below Lamartine, if you compare his moral and artistic influence with that exercised by the latter over a large proportion of the world's population. From Christiania to Corfu, from Smyrna to Moscow, from the Nile to the Rhine, from civilization to the desert, in the villas of the Crimea, and in the school-rooms of Boston or New York, the *Méditations* are known by heart; and there is scarcely a human being among all those who have thus learnt them, who has not found, (or fancied he found,) at some period of his life, a sort of escape from his special pain in their excessive spirituality. We say "escape" advisedly, not consolation; Lamartine is too immaterial to console. He is serenely ecstatic, not impassioned; but we must admit that he has flooded our toiling covetous age with all that it could absorb of the Ideal, and without which, it would perhaps have been by many more degrees nearer to irretrievable corruption than we may care to recognise. For this reason, it is impossible to pass over Lamartine and the action he has exercised in silence; though, again we say, he has never been a conscious and determined stemmer of the stream, never a resolute, inflexible champion of the right. Lamartine has been *an artist*, the first in his own country and perhaps in our age—but an artist always, and as an artist he must be judged.

Having made it, as we think, evident that the thinkers and writers who, in France, have most gone counter to the age, are those who have most loudly preached the doctrines of disinterestedness, who have sought to lead the public mind towards the respect due to moral dignity and indifference to fortune; we must add that of these, two stand forth pre-eminent above the rest. There are two names which, so long as the French language subsists, can never be separated in the minds of Frenchmen from the most glorious defence of everything elevated against everything corrupt; these are the names of Villain and Cousin. Here we must go back a few years.

From 1817 to 1829 there were three teachers of the youth of France round whose professorial chair the crowd regularly assembled, but whose teachings were far from having the same origin, and whose influence was far from being equally powerful. M. Guizot had auditors, Villemain and Cousin had disciples; the former disposed of what the French call "*un public*," the latter ruled over an army ready to go whither he went. And this was in fact just. To be the teacher and leader of youth it is not sufficient that a man should be able, he must also be convinced. He must act what he writes, be what he teaches, and if the man and the talent be distinct, the influence will be accidental, and ultimately provoke in the momentarily influenced that sort of rebellious and angry feeling which follows on deception. Such has been the case with M. Guizot, and this is what will, in the judgment of posterity, ratify the popular judgments of his contemporaries, and separate his name from the two really glorious ones we have mentioned. His ambition was a small, theirs an immense one, and each has received the reward he laboured for. A long-enduring prime-ministry,—"*un grand ministère*," as it was called, made to endure by any means, but during which the prime minister held in his hands the destinies of a great country, and was one of the springs of all the political movements in Europe,—this satisfied the ambition of M. Guizot. No ministry that should have been offered to either of the men we have named, would to them have seemed other than beneath them, had its price been that of one single dereliction from what they felt they owed *themselves*. Both these men taught by their actions as well as by their words, and therefore their influence has been dominant and lasting, and their fame will be permanent as it is pure. Hence we say each of the three won the reward he coveted; for whilst at the present hour the veneration of the studious youth of France is, if it be possible, more profound for Villemain and for Cousin than was that of their fathers five-and-twenty years ago, the general disaffection (to use no harsher term) of the young and high-hearted throughout the nation, has been the price at which M. Guizot purchased the transitory power he valued above everything else, and to preserve which he drew back before no compunction of conscience.

There is no word the highest and truest sense of which is so greatly misapprehended, in these days, as *honesty*. To be honest is not to be merely superior to pecuniary temptation, which is almost exclusively the perverted sense we in our day attach to the expression. A man's honesty consists in his adoption of a standard of right which he openly avows; and to which he unswervingly acts up. His honesty is the same with his integrity; to be honest, he must, as the Germans say, be "one with him-

self," and, consequently, he may be irreproachable on the score of speculation, yet essentially dishonest; led away, it may be, by his interests or his passions from what his intelligence recognises as right. The attraction which is to draw him downwards, and make him false to himself, need not be personified by base coin, and the price of his integrity may be represented in a hundred different ways. Power was what tempted M. Guizot; the vanity at the same time, rather than the reality of power, for his long maintenance at the head of the Government of France was secured only by his undeviating subserviency to the King. What by the vulgar is called "Power," but what, reduced to its proper meaning, is no more than *office*, was at once the *mobile* and the aim of M. Guizot; in it lay his inspiration. We, in this country, allowed ourselves to be surprised at his conduct upon one special occasion; but had we been more familiar with the real nature of the man, we should have known that his behaviour with regard to the Spanish marriages, was the course of conduct most in keeping with his character; that, indeed, by which he preserved self-consistency. Political levity is his one distinguishing characteristic.

These few remarks we have thought necessary, in order to explain the causes of the relative respect which, in France, surrounds certain illustrious names, and of the greater or less influence over the public mind generally, which is the attribute of their wearers.\* Most people, at all conversant with the contemporary political history of France, are familiar with the uncompromising honesty (meaning by that term adherence to a uniform standard of right) shown by M. Villemain, upon the various occasions of his career, when he was either called upon to accept or to resign office; and if we follow him in his public life, step by step, we shall invariably find evidence of undeviating integrity that never admits there can be "two sides" of a question where *truth to self* is at stake. Unwavering self-allegiance is what characterizes the two illustrious men we allude to, and gives them in their own country a place apart as much in their moral faith as in their fame.

One circumstance—we may here mention—will suffice to show our readers the tone of elevation habitual to M. Cousin, and reveal the ground of the influence he possesses with honest and

---

\* A convincing proof of the way in which the influence we mention is still enduring, will be found in what occurred the other day in Paris, when the students rose in scornful protestation against the teachings of M. Nizard. Upon each several occasion, when the Government caused them to be examined, they had recourse to the same reply: "Talk of our disrespect for our Professors!—give us Professors who are worthy of our respect—tell M. Villemain or M. Cousin to come and teach us as they taught our fathers, and you will see whether they have any cause to complain!"

high-hearted men, not more from his doctrines than his actions. After the first hurricane had swept over France and her institutions in February 1848, M. Cousin was one of those who clearly saw the duty of resistance, and the necessity of the reconstruction of a unity in the state. He was amongst those who rallied round the President (Louis Napoleon) throughout; who were of opinion that it would be wise to give an increase of extension to his action in the Government, and who not only divined a portion at least of his capacity, politically speaking, but were personally drawn towards him by irresistible sympathy. M. Cousin was foremost amongst those who advocated the Revision of the Constitution, and who would have legally prolonged Louis Napoleon's exercise of power. M. Cousin's creed in politics is based upon what to us might seem a somewhat excessive extension granted to the Governing Force; he believes in the necessity, the sanctity of authority. In a very large concentration of authority in the hands of the Executive Government, M. Cousin discerns nothing which is incompatible with his notions of human dignity; consequently, the manner of its establishment once forgiven or forgotten, there would be less in the actual form of Government in France to shock M. Cousin's sense of duty and right, or his sense of patriotism, than we might, perhaps, have been inclined to believe. After the *coup d'état*, (but previous to the assumption of Empire by the President,) it would, if our information be correct, have been most easy for M. Cousin to have participated (and that in the highest possible proportion) in the administrative task of Louis Napoleon; nay, some persons even go so far as to say it was not easy for him to avoid so doing. He is, as are all really high-souled men, a lover of power,—that is, of the power which, allied to entire responsibility, makes the degree of good achieved the sole rule whereby to measure the achiever's worth, and which, thus appreciated, is the highest attribute of man. Everything, therefore, combined together to lure M. Cousin back into public life, and to tempt him, so to say, from his integrity. But in vain! There was something that spoke higher even than the voice of legitimate ambition, and this was the voice of fidelity to self. At the period of the Hundred Days, M. Cousin was a royalist volunteer, and there was a unity in his whole career which he could not break by serving the nephew of the first Napoleon, the man who had, himself, laid violent hands upon all those who defended the constitutional and parliamentary liberties of France. Whether, with all the force of his ardent nature, M. Cousin longed to plunge anew into the excitement of political life, to assume responsibilities he felt he could bear?—whether the sacrifice of this desire was a painful and dif-

ficult one?—these are problems which it is wholly beyond our province to solve. But the sacrifice was made, and steadfastly true to his own ideal, to himself, M. Cousin has purchased thereby the right to influence the youth of France at the present moment as he influenced them five-and-thirty years ago, to offer his career as a commentary upon his works, to be, by acts as by doctrines, *an example*. M. Cousin has done what few men could do: he has, at the distance of more than a quarter of a century, given to the public a summary of his system of philosophy, without having found it requisite, in the plenitude of maturity, and after all the vicissitudes of a long and active political existence, to alter one phrase of the vehement lessons of the young professor who had barely completed his twenty-fifth year. The volume entitled *Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien*, is but the *résumé* of M. Cousin's *Cours de Philosophie* from 1817 to 1822, of that philosophy which, as he has said himself, "is the natural ally of every good cause; which comes to the support of religious feeling, and inspires all art, all poetry worthy of the name; which is the inseparable companion of right, and which, repugnant equally to anarchy and despotism, teaches man to love and to respect his fellow-man, and leads humanity to the recognition and acceptance of the only true republic—possible in Europe in our age—the republic represented by constitutional monarchy."\* These have been from the first, and are now more than ever perhaps, the opinions, moral and political, of M. Cousin.

Though no longer the occupant of the Professor's chair at the Sorbonne, no one during the eighteen years of Louis Philippe's reign was so perpetually upon the breach as M. Cousin, after the Revolution of 1830 had called all the talent of the Restoration into the activity of political life. Whether as Minister for Public Instruction and Grand Master of the University, or as a Peer of France,—whether by tongue or pen, in speeches, *rapports*, projects of laws, or books, all his talent and energy were untiringly devoted to what may be regarded as the two ruling passions of his life: the freedom of intelligence represented by the freedom of education, and the elevation of the standard of morality in France. No one more boldly, steadily, or uncompromisingly went against the current of the age, counter to all its baseness, than M. Cousin; and for the last twenty years there is no public vice or national weakness that has not wrung from his lips an eloquent protest. "Humble yourselves not before fortune, but be used to bow your heads before law. Awaken in your hearts the noble feeling of respect. Know how to admire: learn to venerate great

men and great things. Throw from you that enervating literature, now grossly sensual and now over-refined, which delights in painting whatever is most abject in human nature, and fosters our foibles and courts our imagination and our senses only, instead of elevating the mind and speaking to the soul. Ward off the disease of the age, namely, the fatal leaning towards a too easy life, incompatible with every generous ambition. Whatever may be your career, propose to yourselves a high aim, and serve it with fidelity unshaken. *Sursum corda. Raise your hearts on high*, that is the true, the only secret of all philosophy.\* These were the principles which M. Cousin perpetually sought to instil into the youth of his country, by which he sought to lead them to a nobler appreciation of their moral and intellectual duties, and by which, in spite of the gradual debasement of the French standard of morality, it is undeniable that he has preserved his hold upon public opinion, and his influence over the generations succeeding those, whose more immediate teacher and master he was.

There is a point in the passage above quoted, to which we would more particularly refer, because it is nearly connected with the contemporary literary history of France. We allude to M. Cousin's recommendation to avoid the "enervating literature" of the hour. Never was objurgation more called for, as never were efforts more energetic and conscientious than those persistently directed by the illustrious commentator of Plato and Descartes against the monstrous edifice of wrong, built up by the writers of fiction, and regarded by the unreflecting crowd as the temple of the literature of France in the nineteenth century.

It would carry us beyond our limits to examine in what degree one of the really greatest writers France has produced—M. de Chateaubriand—was the source of half the evil, whereof George Sand, Alfred de Musset, and others of their school, were the active promulgators; but undoubtedly, over the High Altar of the Temple we are speaking of, fell the shade of "*René*" in its gloomy baleful beauty. "*René*" was certainly at the bottom of more than half the immorality that became incarnate in so many various types during the thirty or forty years following its publication. But this was merely one form of unloveliness and untruth. A man possessed by an incestuous love for his own sister, was something wherewith to delight the impure imagination of the public. The progeny of "*René*" may be traced above all in the creations of Victor Hugo, and in those of Madame Sand; ugliness, moral or physical, is their generative law. In the hunchbacks and executioners of the former, beloved by

\* *Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien. Avant-Propos. P. 10.*

queens or fair young girls, as in the swindlers and galley-slaves of the latter, who reign supreme over the purest female souls, will be recognised the mark of relationship with the miserable hero of Chateaubriand, whose attraction for his descendants lies far less in his poetic beauty (fearful as it is) than in his sin. He charms them by crime, and we see the result. But, whilst Hugo was storming the stage of the *Théâtre-Français* with his repentant courtizans, his footmen enamoured of Princesses, his robbers rivals to Emperors, and his long procession of masks where invariably the low born were sublime, and the noble of race infamous; whilst Madame Sand was displaying all the resources of her sophistry to prove that truth was falsehood, but especially that vice was virtue, and virtue vice, lesser talents—talents soaring at all events into less lofty spheres, were busy exciting the grosser appetites of the reading world. Alexandre Dumas was feeding France with the story of Monte Cristo's endless wealth, and Eugène Sue was stirring up class-hatreds with the ignoble tale of the *Mystères de Paris*. The noble taste for serious literary pleasures that had once been the distinguishing characteristic of French society was sinking day by day, and becoming degraded into the mere empty desire for vicious excitement. "*La France s'ennuie*," was the term expressive of the peculiar state of the country during the last period of Louis Philippe's reign, and, like all who are afflicted with that wearing malady, "*la France*" sought for distraction, and for little else besides. Those writers who did not choose, like Balzac, Eugène Sue, Alfred de Musset, or Madame Sand, to exercise their powers upon the perpetual distortion of the events incidental to domestic life in the present age, found, like Alexandre Dumas, Victor Hugo, and the tribe of their followers, a singular and apparently lively delight in the distortion of historical chronicles. The national History of France was disfigured by these short-sighted sectarians, who believed in the usefulness and in the possibility of a permanent disguise of truth; and, thanks to their misrepresentations, the men and the events that were entitled to the admiration of all French patriots, were held up to the animadversion of the crowd, in no country so ignorant as in France.

This was one of the tendencies of French literature, against which no one protested by his works more strenuously and more efficaciously than M. Cousin; and his activity, his erudition, and his influence as an historian, are things that must not be overlooked by those who desire to have an accurate notion of the intellectual movement in France since the Revolution of July. We must repeat our author's own words: "*Dans un grand siècle tout est grand*," for they represent the formula, as it

were, of his historical creed, mark out his starting-point and his aim, and are the complete, as they are the first expression of his sense of what to him seemed a debt due to the history of his country. With these words M. Cousin commenced his first Essay relating to the men and women of France in the first half of the seventeenth century. He had not long left the Ministry of Public Instruction, he was still a Peer of France; and, turning disgusted from the meanness of the age, rendered more and more palpable to him by each successive field of activity upon which he entered, the great Platonist of our times sought for some really glorious period in the past which he could regard with complacency. This, to the conscientious seeker, was not difficult to find, and in the first sixty years of the seventeenth century lay manifestly the period that afforded the most marked and useful contrast between the France of the past and that of our own days. The period "inspired," as M. Cousin says himself, "by the genius that prompted Henri IV., Richelieu, and Mazarin, dictated the Edict of Nantes, and the Treaty of Munster and of the Pyrenees, and whence sprung Corneille's *Cid*, Descartes's *Discours de la Méthode*, Pascal's *Provinciales*, Molière's *Misanthrope*, and all the finest sermons of Bossuet; the genius to be everywhere recalled and glorified, because," adds our author, "it is the genius of France herself at the hour of the completest development of her national grandeur."\*

To this conviction of the usefulness of putting before the eyes of degenerate France the picture of what she had been when greatest, the students of French history owe the rectification of a great error, that, namely, (alluded to above,) of the confusion of the two halves of the same century. After an attentive perusal of M. Cousin's later works, it is no longer possible to identify the greatness of the seventeenth century with the person of Louis XIV. With a deep sense of all that monarch's very remarkable qualities, and a thorough appreciation of the many admirable elements in his character, both as an individual and as a king, M. Cousin at once separates the power and the morality—the upward tendency and uncompromisingness—the purity, the healthfulness, the greatness of the age, from the lover of Madame de Montespan and of Madame de Lavallière.

"It is not to be contested," he says, "that Louis XIV. loved his own family and himself better than he loved France; it is not to be contested that he left humbled, weakened, dissatisfied, and already full of the germs of revolution, that France which Henri IV., Richelieu, and Mazarin had transmitted to him glorious and strong, preponderant abroad, tranquil and contented at home. Louis XIV. closes the seven-

\* *Madame de Longueville*, p. 12.

teenth century, which he neither inspires nor represents in its entirety. Under Henri IV., Louis XIII., and Anne of Austria, are born, formed, and developed the great statesmen and great warriors, as also the great writers of both sexes, those even who, like Bossuet and Madame de Sévigné, prolong their career to the farthest limits. The influence of Louis XIV. is only perceptible much later. Called to the head of the Government in 1661, he began by following in the wake of his age, not by overruling it. He was *himself* for the first time, only when no longer guided by Lyonne and Colbert, the last disciples of Richelieu and Mazarin. From that moment, governing alone, he leaves everywhere the impress of himself; in politics, in religion, in manners, in letters, and in the arts. Everywhere he substitutes what is merely noble for what is great, replaces strength by dignity, and by elegance supplants grace. He rubs out the force of individual character, and, so to say, polishes the surface of souls; he destroys great vices, but great virtues also with them; he puts the purely literary (and therefore somewhat inferior) school of Racine and Boileau in the place of that great school of virtue, of politics, and of war, founded by Pierre Corneille, and to Descartes, Bossuet, and Pascal, he gives for successors Massillon, Fontenelle, Voltaire, the real offspring of the end of the seventeenth century. After Madame de Sévigné, almost the rival of Molière, we have Madame de Maintenon, the model of decorum, and her dependants, Mesdames de Caylus, de Staal, (Mademoiselle de Launay,) and Lambert. Join to all this, the gratuitous revocation of the Edict of Nantes, at the very moment when Protestants rivalled with Catholics in the task of serving the State, and when their most illustrious families were coming round to the old faith,—add also the deplorable wars of the terminating years of the reign, with under-clerks for ministers, and courtiers for generals, and the object of which was to replace the Stuarts on the English throne, and the crown of Spain on the head of a French Prince,—and it is easy to see how the close of the age differs from its commencement.”

We have given this extract in full, because not only does it establish a fact which the historical student ought to be well aware of, and which has, till now, never been sufficiently explained, but it contains, to our mind, the most concise and best appreciation of the era of Louis XIV., as opposed to the preceding half century, that is anywhere to be found; and it furnishes, besides, another testimony to M. Cousin's philosophical unity, (if we may so term it,) as exemplified by all his writings and all his studies, whether bearing upon psychology, history, or art. M. Cousin is a lover of greatness, moral and intellectual.

There is, in M. Cousin's talent and character, something so essentially incompatible with whatever is neither elevated nor pure, that from the moment when you open one of his Historical Biographies, you are almost assured of attaching yourself pas-

sionately (as does the author) to its hero or heroine, because you instinctively feel that you are likely to rise in your own esteem by so doing. *Madame de Longueville*, *Jacqueline Pascal*, *Madame de Hautefort*,—all studies based on the deepest erudition and most patient research,—have the interest of the most stirring romance, from the ardent sympathy of the writer with whatever is magnanimous, especially if it be a magnanimity conjoined with misfortune.

And here, again, we may observe M. Cousin's inflexible opposition to his age: in that he refuses to worship fortune, and boldly places what is right above what is successful. In his history of *Madame de Longueville*, M. Cousin has sought far more to show what society was in the first half of the seventeenth century, than to give the public a mere biography of the sister of Condé. He has shown what were the noble tastes, the elegant pleasures, the refined habits, and the liberal tendencies of the French aristocracy of that age which he styles "incomparable," because it really, to use his own expression, "worshipped whatever was great." "*Cette société incomparable, qui a eu le culte de toutes les grandes choses!*" This M. Cousin seeks to reanimate, and to offer to his countrymen as a living model for their imitation. When we speak for instance of the "liberal tendencies" of society as it was constituted in the seventeenth century in France, we would wish to be well understood, for upon no part of the modern history of that country have so many errors become accredited. In such hands as those of Henri IV. and Richelieu, of Anne of Austria and Mazarin, the power and prestige of the throne ran no risk of being attained, and, in the eyes of the nation, royalty was possessed of an absolute power of consecration. This being the case, there was an exalted social sphere, the admission to which was dependent upon the sovereign's will, and the qualification for which lay as much in merit as in birth. The consequence was, what has so long been the case with us, an obligation on the part of the aristocracy to *deserve*, a necessity for competition and for exertion in those who naturally belonged to the higher ranks. That those who are born with a larger amount of educational advantages than the rest should thus in a general way have the superiority over their competitors,—affords nothing that can in any degree disturb a sane conception of equality. So long as the higher-born man consents to compete with his inferior, socially speaking, the principle of equality is preserved, the "*fair start*" is established, and this notion is falsified only when the more nobly born arrogates to himself any participation in the work of government in virtue merely of his birth, and independently of his personal deserts. Now, if we contrast the state of society in France during the

first half of the seventeenth century and during the period of the last seventy or eighty years, we shall have no difficulty in seeing on which side stands genuine liberalism. Without adducing as a proof Mazarin (who, for many reasons, might be regarded as an individual and exceptional example,) Richelieu himself,—*the Cardinal*, the omnipotent, the man whose blood mixed with the blood-royal of France\* and who caused himself to be painted with the globe in his hand and the arms of France quartered with his own,—Richelieu was but a very small personage compared with the high and mighty *Seigneurs* of the French aristocracy, whose influence in the State (the remains of feudalism) he overthrew, but who would at any time have been delighted to unite their names with his. Colbert, again, was of positively low extraction, yet, in later years, Louis XIV. found no difficulty in allying the daughters of the man he had raised to the highest administrative position in the kingdom, to three of the greatest families that kingdom possessed. The marriage of Mdlles. Colbert with the Dukes de Beauvilliers, de Chevreuse, and de Mortemart, was not an event which produced a sensation in society, or at which people held up their hands in wonder and reproof—it was the natural consequence of their father's transcendent merit, of the services he had rendered his country, of the consecrating force resident in royalty, and of the principle of competition which in reality lay at the basis of the political institutions of the time. Since the Restoration of 1815, but especially since 1825-6, the position attained to by Colbert (that is, his social as well as his political position) would have been impossible; the equivalents of the three names we mention would not have been united by marriage to the daughters of a petty tradesman, however high his talents might have raised him; royalty had not the power (had it possessed the will) to dictate such an alliance, nor had society the same deep and liberal respect for individual worth; “the Faubourg St. Germain” alone, by its senseless clatter and its miserable want of all true political spirit, would have rendered impossible under Charles X. what had been the career of Colbert under Louis XIV. And in this respect Louis XIV. merely continues the traditions of Richelieu and Mazarin, of what may be termed the social policy of Henri IV. and of Anne of Austria.

We owe to M. Cousin's minute and conscientious historical studies the positive certainty of a fact which was till now but half-divined by the most learned, but which now forms a solid basis for the speculations of what, according to the German school,

\* By the marriage of his niece, Madlle de Brézé with the Duc d'Enghien, brother to the Duchesse de Longueville, and later *le grand Condé* himself.

we must entitle the philosophy of history; we allude to the remarkable and undeniable resemblance between our own country with its eminently national institutions and the France of two hundred years ago, as Mazarin inherited it from Richelieu, with its honesty and spirit of independence, its vast territorial fortunes, its aristocracy capable of protecting the crown against the people, and the people against the crown, its sincere loyalty, its generous instincts, its intense respect for individual worth, and its enlightened, firmly rooted, liberal tendencies in all ranks.

There is hardly a social failing of modern France which does not find its condemnation in M. Cousin's historical biographies, and it is for that reason that he merits well of his country, and of the rising generation. M. Cousin appealed to what is good in humanity, and he has been successful in evoking it. He sees himself the object of ardent reverence on the part of his countrymen, and has the satisfaction of knowing that, where ten or twelve years since the leisure hours of the reading world were wasted upon the unhealthy inventions of George Sand or Eugene Sue, they are now, in perhaps a much greater proportion, devoted to his own masterly pictures of the bygone glories of France, and to the study of the authors who have been the sources of his own convictions. For example, who that has read his soul-stirring pages upon that first passionate attachment of the "*grand Condé*," for Mademoiselle du Vigean, a heart-love so entirely reciprocated, so nobly sacrificed to duty, has any desire to breathe anew the unwholesome atmosphere in which spring to light the adulterous sentimentalisms of "*Jacques*," or "*Indiana*," of "*Arthur*," or any of those romances that seek invariably to show what is right as hateful?

When "*Madame de Longueville*" first appeared, the episode of Marthe du Vigean passed almost unnoticed by some of those who were better used to the violent ecstasies of courtezans and criminals; it was thought tame, and by the greater portion it was held unnatural, first that a prince of the blood should have sued in vain, and next, that having done so, he should have continued to love, and have dreamed of marriage with one of his royal cousin's simply well-born subjects. But after a year or two, in virtue of that love for truth which M. Cousin does well to believe inherent in the soul of man, those who read began to feel that there was something beautiful in the deep ardent love immolated to duty, in the gorgeous dream of happiness foregone, upon life's very threshold, by the young hero of twenty-two, and the maiden of eighteen.

Now, what are the principles put forth in *Madame de Longueville*?—what is the cause the book defends? The reverse of

the *causa victrix*,—the cause of those whom fortune betrays. Historically speaking, it is quite impossible, after a due examination of the documents furnished by M. Cousin, to retain the false notion of the nominal heroine of the work, hitherto given of her by superficial chroniclers. Madame de Longueville was neither a manœuvrer, nor an *intrigante*, nor a political adventurer, as she has so often been said to be. She was the woman of one fault,—a great one, no doubt; but for whom, if ever error merited to be excused, excuses were to be found in plenty. More exposed to temptation than perhaps any woman of her time, ill married, and condemned to the heart's solitude, while possessed of one of the tenderest hearts nature ever formed, Anne de Bourbon erred; less strong than her great brother, she yielded where he had known how to resist; but so unreservedly did she love, that her whole life was wrecked upon the shoal of that one, overruling, misplaced affection. Madame de Longueville "loved not wisely but too well," and above all, she loved, like a true woman, subserviently, and, as it were, seeking for pardon by her own entire self-sacrifice. Once attached, the idea never enters her head that she can sever her destiny from that of her unworthy lover, and from that hour the individuality of Anne de Bourbon is lost in that of La Rochefoucauld. He is the actor, she the instrument. Whither he leads there she follows, and war does not trammel, nor the fear of death even stay the obedient course of her who is spell-bound by one passion. But the day comes when the brilliant mirror, in which her felicity was falsely imaged, is broken, and behind it rises up the shape it hid, the shape of wrong. Then is Anne de Bourbon again the true sister of Condé, and neither prevaricating nor coming to a compromise with her conscience, she resolves to expiate before Heaven that for having committed which she feels there is no pardon upon earth. There is no consolation for a nature so pure as hers. The long expiation, the sincere repentance of Madame de Longueville,\* is the moral of M. Cousin's book; and, like him, we cannot avoid being indulgent towards the fair unfortunate, who, for four years of entire though guilty self-devotion, paid the price of twenty-five years of remorse and penitence.

"Ah! without a doubt," exclaims M. Cousin, "it would have been better had Madame de Longueville subdued her own heart, and by courage and vigilance saved herself from all weakness!" The knee should be bent before those who have never erred, before Madame de Hautefort, and Mademoiselle de Lafayette; but in the case of Mademoiselle de Lavallière, and of Madame de Longueville, for example, we a thousand times prefer the opprobrium which both seek to draw down upon themselves to any vain semblance of consideration they

could achieve. Two things alone are touching—true virtue or true passion; one stands upon so lofty an eminence that God alone can reward it; the other cannot be vaunted but may be excused, and even sometimes borrows a kind of greatness from its unselfishness, its sacrifices, its sufferings, but above all from its expiations.”

The sincerity of repentance succeeding to the sincerity of passion, and its expiation being the price unflinchingly paid for what has been unlawfully enjoyed, is, we think, the philosophical point of view from which to judge the work upon Madame de Longueville. It forms thereby an essentially component part of the philosophical system of the man who has so well said, that “no school of philosophy is worthy of the name, if it does not help to produce a larger share of moral good.”

As we find, in the work we have just mentioned, a defence of honesty under the form of sincerity and uncompromisingness, so in *Madame de Hautefort* we have one of the most eloquent apologies ever written of disinterestedness, and of the absolute superiority of mere moral elevation over every other, even over that of the intellect. Another lesson, too, it was well to give to France; for cleverness carried to an exorbitant degree, cleverness set free from every dependence upon conscience, had become so very nearly the synonyme of success, that the mere capacity evinced by an individual for “making his way,” as it is called, grew into a faculty to be worshipped as semi-divine. Society condescended to a species of compassionate contempt for mere virtue, which, put it in what light you would, was regarded as an obstacle. And so it was—an obstacle, and lovely in proportion as it was so; an obstacle to all the treacheries and the meannesses of the time,—to all its shameful buying and selling, its cowardly backslidings, and its vile attempts to reap advantages where it avoided responsibility and risk,—the last obstacle to the gradually increasing vulgarity of tone of the public mind. How is the lesson given? Under the form of one of the fairest, purest, noblest women of whom the annals of feminine excellence have to boast: Madame de Hautefort’s is the life of a woman whom nothing could for one instant lure from her natural elevation; hers is one of those upright souls that cannot stoop, and the greatest praise that can be awarded to her biographer is to say, that he carries you away no less by the beauty of the subject he treats, than by the enthusiastic sympathy with which he treats it.

Marie de Hautefort is famous in history as having been one of the two ladies (Mademoiselle de Lafayette was the other) for whom that melancholy king, Louis XIII., sighed in vain. And the expression is scarcely a proper one, for Louis XIII. was so respectful and shy when brought into the remotest con-

tact with the other sex, that his intensest admiration never aspired to anything beyond the most reserved forms of Platonic worship. The reputation, therefore, of Madame de Hauteport was never for one instant, even by her enemies, called in question, but her virtue was shewn by the way in which she refused to profit by her favour: disinterestedness was the sign of her nobility. Subduing the king by the exceeding though distant idolatry with which she inspired him, Marie de Hauteport disdained being the object of one single injustice, and, to the power and predominance of a reigning favourite, preferred through life to be the steadfast, chivalrous, self-devoted friend of the queen's adverse fortunes—of the queen who, having accepted all her sacrifices, sacrificed her in the end, and, after a long-enduring disgrace, only received her once more to die in her arms.

It is not our purpose to enter into the details of the merits of the personages portrayed by M. Cousin—our business is with their author, and with them only in so far as they serve to bring out his peculiar qualities as a writer and thinker, and to make manifest his individual action upon the French public. "*Il faut sonder comme telle pensée est logée en son auteur, comment, par où, jusqu'où il la possède,*" says Pascal, and our principal relation with M. Cousin as an historian, is precisely what the author of the *Provinciales* marks out: we want to know *how he thinks his thoughts*, according to Pascal's fine expression,—what is their nature, to what extent he carries them. Nothing is easier to discover. M. Cousin seeks in history for those acts which, by their moral loveliness, prove the inseparability of all beauty from abstract truth—namely, from virtue, for that which is *true* in the deeds of man is simply that which is *right*—whatever is *wrong* is *false*. If you were to draw M. Cousin into a discussion upon the merits of Cardinal Richelieu as a statesman, if you were to put opposite to him a determined adversary of the Cardinal, you would soon be convinced that no one probably in our times knows so well how to judge the political greatness of that wonderful man,—that no one so impartially measures all the good he achieved for France, all that, still more extensive and solid, he would have achieved had his life been longer. Perhaps, were M. Cousin to write a history of Richelieu, (as he is now said to be writing one of Mazarin,) his readers would be astounded to see how small seems the sum of the Cardinal's misdeeds compared to the vastness and elevation of his plans, when the proper degree of relative importance is awarded to each of his acts, by a biographer whose strong political sense is one of his chief merits. But when, instead of calling upon M. Cousin to weigh Richelieu's civilizing influence against Richelieu's cruelty, Richelieu's

public greatness against Richelieu's individual defects, you put him to decide between politics altogether and the disdain of them conceived by a pure human soul, then you need not wait an instant to perceive with what enthusiasm he enlists himself in the cause of right against might. Here the choice is between things human and things divine, and no hesitation is admissible. Politics granted, M. Cousin must go with the Cardinal against his detractors; but the question being once raised between the greatness which is of this world and that which can never pass away, he must be upon the side of Madame de Hautefort and chivalrously and unreservedly he does battle for the loftiness of the soul against any degree of loftiness of the mere intellect.

It is because Marie de Hautefort is incapable of comprehending why either Richelieu or Mazarin is great, that she is so resplendent with beauty and truth in the eyes of the philosopher who has said that, "justice is its own principle," and that "the obligation of man to do his duty invariably, is not an obligation towards others but towards himself."\* The simple, high-minded girl who, without fortune, and surrounded by every temptation, refused the offers of friendship of the master of all France, when "in all France there lived no one who was not sighing to be noticed by him," admirably personifies disinterestedness in its inflexible contempt of power. Here, again, there is no "success," and fortune has no favours in store for her who disdains her; but the ill-fortune has such invincible attraction, as depicted by the hand of M. Cousin, disgrace is so majestic, that of those who read, corrupt though they may be, there are probably few who would not forego all worldly advantages, with Madame de Hautefort, for the sake of being chronicled as she now is. It is no slight thing in the France of the present day to put the care for the esteem of honest men in the place of the exclusive care for profit, and by the force of truth, and the efforts of genius, to re-excite in the *élite* of a nation that thirst for moral consideration, which, according to one of the sublimest of modern writers, "constitutes the largest and most evident portion of human happiness;"† and this M. Cousin has helped to do. As in "*Madame de Longueville*," so in "*Madame de Hautefort*," the manner of the recital and its accessories are so charming that the reader is carried away, and no work of mere fiction leaves a deeper impression upon the imagination than this biography, where every detail is due to the minutest historical research.

We cannot refrain from the quotation of one passage which

---

\* *Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien.* 14th Lesson. P. 351.

† Pascal. *Pensées.*

places distinctly opposite to each other the two principles on which depends the dramatic interest of the work :—

“Now that we embrace the entire course of the seventeenth century,” says M. Cousin, “now that we mark its nearly regular progression from the glorious beginnings of Henri IV. to the closing and sad years of Louis XIV., it is easy for us to understand, to absolve Richelieu. We easily conceive that to do away with the remains of feudalism, to raise irrevocably the royal prerogative above the constant claims of an exaggerated, ungovernable, turbulent aristocracy, to prevent the Protestants from forming a state within the State, and to bring them necessarily within the application of the common law, to stay the progress of Austria, mistress already of half Europe, to extend the French territory, to introduce elements of order and unity into a new society, full of life and force, but also of dissident principles—to do all this, there was unavoidably required extraordinary vigour, perhaps even for a moment a species of dictatorship, nay, a form of despotism, national, however, and intelligent. But despotism must always be seen from afar; too closely visible, it revolts all upright hearts, and whilst, in the eyes of posterity, the importance of the end excuses (not injustice, that is for ever inexcusable, but) the extreme severity of the means,—in the eyes of contemporaries, the severity of the means, provoking generous indignation, hides the importance of the end. Who amongst the firmest partisans of Richelieu, who amongst us all, can say he would have approved when he became a witness to so many hardships pitilessly inflicted to so many exiles and executions? Contemporaries alone saw all this: Richelieu, dying, left an execrated name, and, when alive, counted as his adherents, but a very few political spirits, at the head of which, it should be well remarked, stood the king. Let us then for an instant take the place of a young girl, born of a feudal race, brought to her Court by the queen-mother, and at fifteen thrown into the midst of that of Anne of Austria! Let us avow that, the nobler, the more generous was her heart, the less could her intelligence see clear in the affairs of the day. She could know nothing of the real interests of France, nor of the state of Europe, nor of history, nor of politics. All her sense—all that, in her, was so loudly praised for its refinement and vivacity—availed not to pierce through one veil of the future or past, whilst in the present she was hurt in every instinct of gentleness and honour.”

The “present” in this case is represented by Richelieu, and Marie de Hautefort is a girl of fifteen; she is a woman of seven-and-twenty when, twelve years later, the dominant will (perhaps of inevitable use in its action on France) bears the name of Mazarin, but years have not made her more pliant, she is still upright as before, and, as ever, disdainful of power.

“Honour,” says her biographer, “was everything for Madame de Hautefort. She liked the Court, she loved splendour, but she loved

her own fame still better, and she had that passionate worship of esteem which renders even the shadow of a concession impossible. When she saw little by little all her old friends put aside, disgraced, proscribed, once more reduced to go the accustomed way of imprisonment and exile, she was too proud to cross over to the side of fortune, but stayed by the victims of the hour, spoke their language, shared their risks, and looked the new and triumphant Richelieu face to face. The reason of state must say that she was wrong. But if generosity and delicacy of feeling be still the synonyme of woman, where is the woman, where, indeed, the honourable man, who can blame? Who will not bow down respectfully before that noble creature who, after having heroically served her royal mistress for twelve years, disdaining the favour of a king and the promises of an omnipotent minister, at the very moment when she has a right to expect the reward of all her trials, when she is on the eve of securing the predominance and fortune of which she perhaps had dreamed in early youth, spurns from her all these gains, and, without hesitation, as without regret, rushes onwards to welcome irrevocable disgrace rather than fail in the duty she owes to herself?"

Again we say, our object is not to shew what constituted excellence in Marie de Hautefort, but what in that excellence attracts, fascinates, carries away the eminent writer whom we have undertaken to make better known to the English public. Madame de Hautefort, as Madame de Longueville, as Jacqueline Pascal, as all those "austere or graceful" figures of the past that have been evoked within the last ten years by M. Cousin, are by us merely to be considered as a medium of inspiration, as the representatives of the ideas which most subjugate him, and through which he most influences the French public. Before bidding adieu to Marie de Hautefort, and terminating this lengthened article, let us note one sentence, and the expression of one feeling, which is, as it were, the key-note of all the moral harmonies of our author's nature. Upon a certain occasion, when Madame de Hautefort had risked, in the service of the queen, honour, reputation, life, everything—M. Cousin describes the ardent promises made by Anne of Austria to her young friend, promises of future acknowledgment in better times; and he then exclaims, "But what reward could be given? had Marie de Hautefort not already had her only, her all-sufficing reward? Had she not in danger felt her heart expand with that energy which animates heroes? her reward was given: she had for another forgotten herself, she had sided with the oppressor against the oppressed!" When a writer thus identifies himself with his subject, when the high deeds of his hero thus inspire the historian, it is no longer the biography of another he is writing, he is trusting the world with his own entire self.

For the very reason, therefore, that he is one with his subject, must M. Cousin be studied, and that minutely, in his historical portraits of the seventeenth century. Take him merely as a philosopher, and you have but a part of his genius; you lack the application of his philosophical principles. These are applied—and the more intensely so because involuntarily—to the historical personages he revives and animates by them, and under whose form he combats every error of his country and of his age.

That there has been, and that there is still, a very great deal to say against the temper of the time in France, is not to be denied, and we do not suppose our readers will accuse us of trying to conceal the fact; but it would be unfair not to note, at the same time, the awakening of the spirit of reaction. To the two predominant forms of corruption in France—disorder and gold-worship—there is now beginning to be opposed a certain notion of what is right. This, of course, is confined to but a very few, and public opinion can scarcely yet be said to have made anything beyond a faltering accent heard; still, faltering though it may be, and indistinct, there is no doubt upon which side it gives its timid vote. The days are gone by in France when it was thought possible to ally the ideal to the ugly and the wrong. This much is definitively gained. Through the taste of the French lies the road to their intellectual and moral sense. To replace what is confused by what is simple, what is disordered by what is pure, what is base by what is lofty, what is sordid by what is generous, to excite the public perception of the Beautiful, and shew its inseparability from the True, to stimulate enthusiasm for what is really great, and open all hearts to hero-worship in its widest form—this is the duty of every man in France upon whom Providence has bestowed genius, and whose love for his country is as deep as his discernment of her moral wants is keen. Out of the crowd of those who, gifted with talents sufficient to aid in the work of regeneration, have shamefully perverted their faculties, pandering them for money to the vilest uses, two names alone, we again repeat, are brilliant with a lustre on which no shade has ever been cast. The names of Villemain and Cousin will endure among those of the purest, noblest, loftiest teachers of the human race. Both have equally, during a long life been passionately devoted to those principles whereby man's nature is elevated, but which stand in the way of his material gains; both have held that inflexible moral rectitude was a duty to self, not to others; both have persistently combated the doctrine of success; both represent the springs whence the current in favour of morality, now

faintly beginning to be visible, takes its rise; both are the high priests of enthusiasm, and both confess the creed thus given in sum by the one.

“Admiration for the Beautiful and the True is, for him who conceives it, a happiness and an honour\* too. He is happy in that he feels it; in that he proclaims it, he is to be honoured. Admiration is the sign of nobility of judgment served by nobility of heart. It is, if the terms be allowable, the divine part of taste.”\*

We cannot more appropriately terminate our study of M. Cousin than by these words, which might almost in themselves suffice to paint their author. He has never for an hour been unfaithful to the precepts they convey, and there has been no moment of his career at which he could not, with equal truth, repeat what he once said of himself, that the whole worth of what—*we* and not he—must characterize as a priceless nature, proceeds “from the intense admiration for whatever is admirable.”† By nothing does he more absolutely distinguish himself from the majority of his countrymen.

\* *Du Vrai, du Beau, et du Bien*, p. 155.

† *Jacqueline Pascal—Introduction*, p. 2.

ART. IV.—*The Rise of the Dutch Republic: A History.* By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY. Three volumes, 8vo. London, 1856.

SHOULD any of our readers be planning their continental tour, we advise them to commence with the Low Countries. Not only are they the best prelude to the Alps and the Apennines, but into their narrow limits are condensed more remarkable objects, and more historical recollections than can be found in any single region which they will afterwards visit. To a Scotchman the country itself is the supreme curiosity. So flat is its surface that, approaching from the sea, were it not for a view of low sand-hills you would think that you were sailing straight into the fields. And so you are. At some unforeseen spot, these sandy hummocks open and give you entrance. Like a swan through the duck-weed, your vessel cleaves its way through the verdure; and as you still penetrate mile after mile, and on every side espy ships moving to and fro amongst the trees, and stork-nests, and village steeples, you hardly know to which to compare it,—a vegetating ocean or a molten meadow. Nay, there are spots where, could you steer your vessel to the brink, you might look over and see far under your feet cattle browsing and labourers delving. The fact is, the very river up which you are now floating is standing on stilts. Were it allowed to wander “at its own sweet will,” the surrounding district would be a swamp or an estuary; but held aloft in its osier-wattled channel, the staid and well-conducted current keeps the bounds prescribed, whilst its barges are floating and its fishes are leaping far above the heads of the boors and the burghers.

We need not describe the processes by which the “Hollow-land” has been reclaimed from the ocean, and by which it is preserved from those fluvial inundations which lately devastated the southern departments of France. But the result is sufficiently remarkable. The very soil of this country is a greater triumph of industry and perseverance than the Pyramids of Egypt or the Wall of China. To rear these stupendous structures needed only a single burst of enthusiasm,—the fiat of one despot, or the toil of one generation. But rood by rood to reclaim from the greedy deep not a farm but an empire, and to retain the possession in the face of a foe who never flags and seldom slumbers, is one of the most wonderful achievements in the records of human strength and patience. If Switzerland and other sublime countries have helped to create their inhabitants, the sublime thing about the Hollanders is that they have created a country for themselves. And if to a stranger it is an

impressive sight to stand on the cupola of St. Paul's, and look out on a horizon filled with monuments, churches, palaces; to us it was even more striking to stand on the town-house of Leyden, and look down on a fair province covered with its web of silvery waters. "What a strong, brave, people! These streets were once the open sea. On that corn-field fishes have been caught. That orchard was once an oyster-bed. What a stout heart they had who first resolved to pump off the ocean; and what a sturdy arm they needs must have who hold back its waters year by year!" Do you call the Dutch a prosaic people? and do you laugh at their phlegmatic temper? Holland is itself a poem. Beneath the salt waves it needed some genius to espy a land flowing with milk and bristling with barley; and it needed some spirit to dive down into the turbid waters and fetch the vision to the light of day.

On the other hand, their territory has been to the Hollanders an excellent teacher. On being shewn over the property of a Carse of Gowrie laird whom he was visiting, a Duke of Atholl naïvely remarked to his host, "What a fine estate,—if it had just remained at home!" Like the Carse of Gowrie, and like the Delta of Egypt, Holland is in great part the gift of the mountainous regions which feed the Rhine. Nearly the whole of it has jaunted down the Falls of Schaffhausen, and waltzed with the Lurlei, and looked soft at Johannisberg, and frowned at the Drachenfels, before it was spread out in the pastures of Holland and sprang up in the forests of Haarlem and the Hague; and were France, Switzerland, and Germany reclaiming their runaway soil, little besides their ships would be left to the present appropriators. And herein we have an emblem of the rise and progress of the Dutch Republic. When by a system of suicidal persecution the sovereigns of Spain, France, and England were driving into exile their best subjects, they all found a welcome in the Netherlands. Those of the Pilgrim Fathers who did not seek freedom in Transatlantic wilds, carried their valour into the armies of Holland, and their industry into its towns. Bayle, Basnage, Lyonnet, Claude, Du Bosc, Saurin, the scholars, naturalists, pulpit orators of France, placed a laurel chaplet on the head of the brave, generous nation which gave them refuge; and whilst French Huguenots were cultivating the sugar-cane in Dutch Guiana, and whilst the Desmarests family were planting at the Cape the famous Constantia vine, their compatriots, the Cromelins, Labouchères, and Van Overzees (Outremer) were in Holland itself founding those firms which have seen three centuries. With the *élite* of Europe to fill their chairs, the halls of Leyden, Groningen, and Utrecht were crowded with students of every nation; and, enriched by the

deposits of Spanish and Belgian Jews, the bank of Amsterdam became the golden wonder of the world. In the same way, whatever other nations neglected was apt to catch the eye and stimulate the industry of this sagacious people. When our own ancestors were by turns sleeping, starving, and fighting in the Hebrides,—still more canny than the canny Scot, their fishermen were ensnaring with Batavian hooks Caledonian cod, and filling no end of Dutch barrels with Gaelic herrings. And when their neighbours were absorbed in sea-fights and naval broils, this prudent people contrived to get into their hands the carrying trade of both hemispheres.

We must not forget, however, that our present theme is “the Rise of the Dutch Republic.”

On the 25th of October 1555, as a preliminary to his long-projected retirement, Charles V. resigned the government of the Netherlands, and leaving to his son, Philip II., the graver task of empire, he withdrew from his native soil, to repeat paternosters and to fast on venison pasties in the cloisters of St. Juste.

That portion of the Burgundian inheritance, then known as the Spanish Netherlands, and which now found itself transferred to Philip, included the greater part of the modern kingdoms of Belgium and Holland. In the southern portion, there was a powerful Celtic element; in the north, the old Teutonic type predominated: but in both north and south there was much of that element which despots find it hard to deal with. Betwixt the charters which they had purchased with their gold, and the respect entertained for citizens who could handle a sword as skilfully as a hammer or a shuttle, and to whom a battle was a pleasing excitement, towns like Bruges, Ghent, Antwerp, and Mechlin possessed great immunities; and, partly resulting from the protectorate of powerful nobles, and still more as a concession to the bluff and sturdy spirit of their people, Zeeland, Holland, and the regions beyond, could boast a large measure of practical freedom. True, the nobles were often mere military sots, without a particle of statesmanship, and some of them, it may be feared, in the courts of Paris and Madrid, had learned to blush at the homely ways and coarse habits of their country. Still, even in these blushes there was a tinge of patriotism,—a confession that the blood which flowed in their own veins was Belgic or Batavian; and altogether, with its numerous little chieftainships, its power of self-taxation, its municipalities, strong in privileges sanctioned by oaths royal and imperial, and above all, with its bold, liberty-loving citizens, the country in question was a sore problem to kingcraft. To describe the various principalities, counties, free cities, and corporations which went together to

form that conglomerate called the Netherlands, would only confuse the reader. Suffice it to say, that Philip II. soon found occupation for life in trying to crush this conglomerate, and that so hard were some of the pebbles which composed it, that in the effort he wore out the most powerful grindling-machine which European despotism ever has erected—the Spanish monarchy, fed by the wealth of the Indies, and concentrating on the devoted country all the terrors of the Inquisition.

The Dutch—for it is with them that we have mainly to do—are a religious people; but they are not ritualists. With their natural homeliness, and with an imagination intellectual and contemplative rather than romantic or sensuous, the gorgeous worship of the Church of Rome had not the spell for them which it had for Italians and Spaniards; and, as a practical people, they were keenly alive to the growing corruptions of the hierarchy, especially the dissolute lives and wasteful luxury of the clergy. Where their judgment was satisfied and where conscience was concerned, capable of being stirred to an enthusiasm little short of frenzy, they had too much shrewdness to believe in shams, and too much honesty to simulate a faith which they felt no longer. And unfortunately for the Papacy, its tinsel had by this time got sadly tarnished, and, instead of a pious zeal to repair the breaches, the Low Country jesters were inclined to laugh at the shabby fabrics and ill-gotten gear which peeped through the tattered finery. Nor was the evil diminished by the elevation to the popedom of a native of Utrecht. No doubt the Dutch felt a momentary glee at the rise of a compatriot to the highest position on earth; but Adrian's antecedents, however creditable to a country clergyman, were scarcely of a kind to exalt the throne of St. Peter. The son of a boat-builder in a small way of business, he was a simple-minded, well-meaning man; but he commanded the good-will rather than the veneration of his fellow-citizens. "Utrecht planted, Louvain watered, and the Emperor gave the increase," was the favourite inscription on this joyful occasion; to which some wag subjoined, what soon became a popular addition, "and God did nothing at all in the matter." Poor Adrian seems to have inclined to this opinion himself. At least when, twenty months afterwards, death released him from his brief pontificate, the epitaph dictated by himself was inscribed on his tomb, "Here lies Adrian the Sixth, who deemed the tiara the greatest misfortune of his life."\* Assuredly, he did not magnify his office, and his frank avowal of abuses and enormities which he was unable to cure, helped

---

\* "*Hadrianus Sextus hic situs est, qui nihil sibi infelicius in vitâ quam quod imperaret duxit.*"

to open the eyes of the Hollanders to the true state of the infallible Church.

Contemporary with Adrian, and with Adrian's predecessor, Leo X., was a man more influential on the age than any pontiff. Leading a life of learned vagrancy, he might be found sometimes lounging in Wolsey's palace at Lambeth, or diverting, with his good stories and ready repartees, the royal ante-rooms at Greenwich; one day prelecting on Greek at Cambridge, another, poring over contracted manuscripts in the King's Library at Paris, and by and by giving audience to admiring cardinals in his apartments at Rome. Of a slight figure and a low stature, gently stooping, with pale yellow hair, his fragile form was enveloped in a furred mantle, under which was a robe somewhat suggestive of monkery; but in his penetrating blue eyes, and in the corners of his keen, well-chiselled lips, there lurked a wit and a refinement then rare in the convent. Living a life of uneasy providence,—with a small pension from Lord Mountjoy, and a larger one (seldom paid, however) from the King of France,—grateful for a few angels from Dean Colet, or any wealthy English patron, and by way of “forget-me-not” borrowing money from all his hospitable entertainers before he went on his way,—this gentleman-beggar was the most learned scholar of his age, and the wittiest man in Europe; the dread of all dunces, and the joy of every genial or learned circle; the correspondent of popes, and the subject of eager competition among princes, who would fain monopolize such a prodigy; and, in the great upheaval of the sixteenth century, the main agent in the revival of letters.

Erasmus was a native of Rotterdam. In order to secure to themselves his little patrimony, his guardians determined to make him a monk. But it was with very different feelings from those with which, a few years afterwards, Martin Luther entered the monastery at Erfurt, that, in 1486, the youthful Desiderius made his profession at Gouda. He was not in search of salvation. With great natural vivacity, it was his way to take all things easily; and even if he had been in earnest, the jovial friars, with their coarseness and hypocrisy, would have put all serious thoughts to flight. Vigils and meagre-days did not suit his languid constitution, and, having a fatal aversion to fish, he kept Lent like a heathen. It was plain that he had never been designed for that “religious life” which consists in meats and drinks, and a propensity for practical jokes made him an inconvenient inmate. In the convent garden grew a pear-tree, which the prior had reserved for his own proper use; but, with the experimental propensity characteristic of a young philosopher, Erasmus had taken a private survey of the forbidden fruit, and was glad to find one point at least in which his tastes coincided

with those of his superior. The consequence was that the pears began to vanish, and the moment a jargonelle had reached the melting point it was sure to evaporate over night. The prior was in despair; and, unable to put trust in any brother, he resolved himself to be the watchman. His post of observation was a window which looked into the orchard. Towards morning he thought he saw something in his favourite tree, and was delighted at having caught the depredator. But just then—perhaps it was the cold of morning which made his reverence sneeze; at all events, the premature explosion scared the thief, who dropped from among the branches, and limped off to his cell, imitating to the life the gait of a lame brother. That morning, after matins, and when all the inmates were assembled in the refectory, the prior called up the cripple monk and charged him with the theft. The poor fellow was thunderstruck, and protested his innocence; but all his asseverations only made the prior furious, and added penitential psalms to the next week's bread and water. Somehow or other suspicion at last turned towards the right quarter, and it was not long before the larking novice found it expedient to quit the convent. Faint efforts were made to capture the runaway, and he commenced that life of mendicant scholarship which in its long tour included nearly all the courts and colleges of Christendom. The Pope gave him a dispensation to eat roast-beef on Friday; and as he represented that the habit of the Dutch convent was in civilized countries mistaken for the dress of a sick-nurse, and that in Italy people shunned him for fear of the plague, his Holiness allowed him to lay aside the frock and cowl, so that at last the wandering scholar retained few remnants of monkery.

The services which Erasmus rendered to the cause of letters and to the great enlightening process commenced in his day, are marvellous when we think of his unsettled life and feeble frame, and still more marvellous when we take into account the absence of any powerful secondary impulse. He had no zeal for the Church of Rome. A mitre could not tempt him to enter the field against Luther. "He is too strong a man for me to encounter; and, to say the truth, I learn more from a page of his than from all the tomes of Aquinas." But his faith and his spiritual sympathies were not intense enough to join the Reformation. In his own oft-quoted words, "I have no inclination to die for the sake of truth. Every one has not the courage requisite to make a martyr; and, if put to the test, I fear I should imitate St. Peter." Nevertheless, keen-sighted in the corruptions of the Church of Rome, but giving no countenance to those who sought to cure them; laughing in his sleeve at St. Peter's successor, but turning a cold shoulder to the men who openly questioned papal authority; refusing the advances of

the Reformers, yet despising the clergy, by whom he knew that he himself was detested; every one's acquaintance and no one's friend; in this remarkable man the place of other motives was supplied by the restlessness of redundant mental power, and that literary instinct which, in the sage of Rotterdam, was the ruling passion. On the strength of this he proceeded till near the three score and ten, editing fathers and classics as fast as Frobenius and Episcopus could print them, and pouring forth volume after volume of his own, brilliant with wit and weighty with practical wisdom. His collection of "*Adages*" is the foundation of all that has since been done, and of the much more that may yet be done, in the department of proverbial philosophy. His "*Colloquies*" and his "*Praise of Folly*" went far to open men's eyes to the abuses and villanies with which the age was teeming, and they made converts to reform where graver assailants would have only roused up resistance to change or the championship of time-honoured corruption. His edition of "*Jerome*," and his "*Notes on the New Testament*," were fresh incentives and welcome aids to the study of the sacred oracles. And above all other services must be ranked that edition of the Greek Testament, with an improved Latin version, which, through the impulse it gave to the study of the Word of God, commenced an era not only in Biblical literature but in vital Christianity; and as it was the perusal of that Testament which opened the eyes of Bilney and Tyndale, and which thus introduced the Gospel to England, its compiler, if not the pilot of the English Reformation, was at least the Pharos that pointed out the harbour.

We have visited the birthplace of Erasmus at Rotterdam, and in Basil we have stood beside his tomb. We confess to the witchery of his genius; and in all the ten massive folios which commemorate his industrious career, we question if there is a single page which does not in some sparkling aphorism, or some good story better told,—in some hit so clever that the reader cannot forget and the victim cannot recover,—in some deliverance on a debated point so clear as to have all the conclusiveness of an intuition, and yet so pungent as to have all the mirth-moving efficacy of a brilliant *mot*,—give evidence of its author's wondrous powers. And yet, all his sense, pleasantry, and seeming moderation notwithstanding, and notwithstanding his boundless scholarship, Erasmus awakens no enthusiasm. With those keen sardonic features, that have lost their faith in men, but not attained to faith in God; impatient of pretence, but not intent on truth; too happy to torment hypocrisy, but with no grand aspirations after the higher virtues, this shrewd, witty, clear-visioned man, always appears to us a sort of ecclesiastical Voltaire; and had there been none but the like of him to quiz

the monks and tread the corns of Roman infallibility, instead of a religious reformation we might have had an Encyclopædist revolution, with its slaughter of priests, its demolition of churches, its desecration of sabbaths, and followed by a gaunt and dreary Atheism. With his straightforwardness, his kingly strength, and his dauntless courage, Luther reminds us of the emblem of God's chosen tribe:—"Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey thou art gone up, my son. He couched as a lion, and as an old lion: who shall rouse him up?" But, trimming betwixt Rome and the Reformation, there is another symbol in that old heraldry which the name of Erasmus inevitably suggests:—"Issachar is a strong ass, couching down between two burdens. And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and he bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant to tribute." Every powerful mind, in every agitated age, is called to repeat the election; and which is it best to be,—a king of the forest, or a partisan of peace at all hazards,—temporizing, bowing the shoulder to bear, and in order to enjoy the pleasant land content to pay the devil's tribute?

In some of the rivers of South America the Indians have an ingenious plan to take the turtle. The marksman fastens a strong head to his arrow loosely with a string, and then shoots it towards the zenith, so aimed that it alights on the back of the unsuspecting chelonian, and fixes deep in the shell. At the same time, the reed-shaft detaches itself, and keeps floating over the spot where the wounded turtle has dived; and, guided by this ingenious buoy, the hunter can easily recover and bring to the surface his game. Something like this is the rationale of arguments winged with wit; the barb fastens and the index floats. Many of his contemporaries dealt at the Papacy blows more deadly than any aimed by Erasmus; but Antichrist is a leviathan, who "laugheth at the shaking of a spear: the sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold; the spear, the dart, nor the habergeon." Grave reasonings and appeals to fathers and apostles have no audience except amongst earnest spirits; and as these are usually the minority, monasticism and infallibility flattered themselves that little damage would ensue from the ponderous lance of Bucer, or even from the sharper sword of Luther. They dived, and, after a little while, they hoped to re-appear unscathed. They would take no notice of what could not be refuted, and by and bye it would be innocuous, because gone into oblivion. But, as regarded this cunning archer from the fens of Holland, there could be no such self-delusion. Mischief so merry was sure to be popular, and his sly hits and wicked sarcasms were already passing into proverbs. A mere rumour that his "*Colloquies*" had got into the *Index Expurgatorius*

sold an impression of four-and-twenty thousand copies, and made the fortune of the publisher. Old soldiers read them at their watch-fires, and laughed inside their corselets; students sat up over nights enjoying the delicious satire, and, combined with beer, the broader jokes at second-hand set pot-house guests a-roaring. High and low this wicked jester was debauching all the laity. The very school-boys had come to understand the sport. Wherever they saw the floating feather, they knew that it was one of the "*jacula Erasmi*," and that they had only to pull up the string and they would find a stricken monk at the other end. And as, by the bobbing of the buoy, they watched the gyrations of some struggling cardinal, less dexterous sportsmen comforted themselves, that shells too hard for their harpoons were pervious to the barbs of Rotterdam.

But whilst, in the minds of the learned and light-hearted, the fun of the brilliant Hollander was fatal to the Papacy, something very different was the germ of the Dutch Reformation. No doubt, in common with what their own observation taught them, the pungent sense of Erasmus went far to sap the superstitious sentiment with which the hierarchy had long been regarded, and thus the minds of even worldly men were prepared to sympathize with the grave protest of thoughtful and awakened spirits. But it was from other sources than Erasmus that these last received their light and inspiration. At a very early period the writings of Luther had been freely imported into Friesland, from which they crossed the *Zuider Zee* to Guelderland and Holland. As early as 1523, two Augustinian monks from Antwerp were burnt as heretics at Brussels, "and from that time," says Erasmus, "Luther's doctrine began to be in great request." And whilst translations of German tracts spread the gospel in the north, along the southern frontier the seeds of truth were wafted from France and rooted in Flanders and Brabant. As early as 1524, "Charles, by the grace of God, Roman Emperor, King of Germany and Spain, Count of Holland and Zeeland," found it needful to issue a "placard" against printing books without a licence; and, as the obnoxious doctrines still spread, the machinery of persecution was set in motion.

In Holland, as in Scotland, the first martyr belonged to the clerical order, and, like Patrick Hamilton, John de Bakker was a young man. He was accused of having preached contrary to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and, which was the gravamen of his offence, he had married a lawful wife. In his interviews with those ecclesiastics who, during his imprisonment, came to convert him, he maintained "that he could submit to no other rule of faith than the Word of God as interpreted by itself, under the teaching of God's own Spirit." He argued that

"Christians were not at liberty to compel any one by outward violence to embrace the faith; that men were not to be 'compelled to come in' otherwise than as God compels them, which is not by prisons, stripes, or death, but by gentleness and by the strength of the Divine Word,—a force as soft and lovely as it is powerful; and that the best compulsion is living and preaching well." Of course, he held that the celibacy of priests was not required by the Word of God, and that not even an angel from heaven could impose a new article of faith, much less the Church, which was subordinate to the Word of God, and had no authority over it. For such sentiments he was condemned to die. Dressed in a yellow coat and a sort of fool's cap, he was led to the place of execution. As he passed the prison where a number of other suspected Protestants were confined, he called out, in a loud voice,—“Behold, my dear brethren, I have set my foot upon the threshold of martyrdom. Have courage, like brave soldiers of Jesus Christ, and, stirred up by my example, defend the truths of the Gospel against all unrighteousness.” The prisoners clapped their hands and answered with a hearty cheer. At the stake he exclaimed,—“O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Death is swallowed up in the victory of Jesus Christ.” And, whilst the pile was burning, his fellow-prisoners were chanting the “Te Deum,” and “O beata martyrum solennia.” This was on the 15th of September 1525; and the following day, rightly judging that such examples were not likely to prejudice the populace against the new opinions, the authorities released several of De Bakker's co-religionists whom they had otherwise intended to put to death.

This martyrdom took place at the Hague, and it was there that two years afterwards the next victim was sacrificed. Wendelnoot Klaas was a widow belonging to the village of Monnikendam, in North Holland. She was asked what she believed regarding the Sacrament of the Mass. “I take it for nothing but a piece of dough.” “Do you pray to the saints and adore their images?” “I know no other Mediator but Jesus Christ.” “You had better remember the fiery trial before you.” “If this power be given you from above, I am prepared to suffer.” “You do not fear death because you have not tasted it.” “That's true; neither shall I ever taste it; for Christ has said, ‘If a man keep my sayings, he shall never see death.’” After she was sentenced to the flames, the judge told her that she might have a priest to whom to confess her sins; but she replied,—“I have confessed all my sins to Christ my Lord, who taketh away all sins. But, if I have offended any of my neighbours, I heartily ask their forgiveness.”

At this period the reform was complicated by a division among

the reformers on the subject of infant baptism,—even as the “re-baptizers” were soon afterwards brought into much and unmerited odium by the excesses of the Anabaptists of Munster, who, to the repudiation of infant baptism, added many wild notions and fanatical excesses. Still, in the eyes of both Romanists and Reformers of that day, apart from any civil offence, it was a grievous crime to suffer a child to grow up unbaptized; and even in the Canton of Zurich, acting on a dictum of Zuingli, “*Qui iterum mergit, mergatur*,” a Baptist preacher was drowned by the Pædobaptist Protestants.

How little foundation there was for the indiscriminate horror with which this party was regarded, will at once be seen by any one who reads the annals of the Low-Country Reformation; and although, at the time, they often received faint sympathy from their fellow-Protestants, many of them well deserved it; for some of the noblest testimonies emitted by that “cloud of witnesses” were uttered by the followers of Menno Simonson. When Jerome Segaerts and his wife were condemned at Antwerp, and he was told that, by returning to the Romish Church, he might yet save his life, he made the noble answer:—“Though you should set open the prison door, and say, Go; only cry, you’re sorry; I would not stir, for I know that I have truth on my side.” From his dungeon he wrote to his wife, much as our Samuel Rutherford wrote to his Anwoth parishioners:—“I find the Lord is with us. I have so much comfort through God’s promises, that I do not so much as think upon any sufferings. I did not imagine that a man could be sensible of such gladness in a prison: it is so great that it will hardly allow me to sleep day nor night. I can scarce think that I have lain here more than one day. O that I could but break my heart in pieces, and distribute it between you and the rest of my friends.” Adds the historian:—“He was burnt the 2d of September. They stayed till his wife was delivered of her child, and then they throw her, one morning early, into the Scheldt.”

For thirty years this process lasted; but although, from Mons and Tournay to Amsterdam, few months elapsed without an offering to the Papal Moloch, persecution was not the main employment of Charles V. Himself a native of the Netherlands, he had a certain kindly feeling towards his fellow-countrymen; a thorough understanding of their tough and stubborn humour, and, perhaps, a grain of imperial gratitude for the blood and treasure which in his service they had poured forth like water. At all events, bigot as he was, he was still more the autocrat; and although he would have been glad to extirpate heresy, he would have hesitated about exterminating races from which his choicest fighting men were furnished, the foresters of Flanders and the

stout yeomanry of Holland. But when the gates of the Spanish convent closed on the abdicated emperor, the Netherlands were left to the tender mercies of a son who, in compassing his fearfully simple end, was hampered by no sympathies, and disdained the old man's scruples.

To Philip II. the people of the Netherlands were strangers, for he could not speak their language; they were barbarians, for they ate fiercely, laughed loudly, and, in the presence-chamber, betrayed a burly irreverence which contrasted unpleasantly with the obsequious courtesy of Spanish cavaliers; and, worse than all, they were reprobates, sons of perdition, whom no pastoral thumb-screws nor paternal gibbets could keep from plunging into open heresy. In the midst of this odious people he only tarried long enough to take the oaths and make the promises requisite for securing subsidies and pecuniary supplies; oaths and promises of which the future was to be the systematic violation, and from the performance of which one might have thought that it would tax the dispensing power of St. Peter to absolve. Arriving in his beloved Spain, and saved from shipwreck, his thank-offering to the Most High was a vow to extinguish heresy; and the first spectacle with which he was regaled on his arrival was an *auto-da-fé* at Valladolid, when the monarch sat in state, and viewed, with eager satisfaction, the burning of thirteen heretics. All his father's edicts against heresy in the Low Countries he revived and re-enforced, and in Anthony Perrenot, better known as Cardinal Granvelle, he found a fitting tool for carrying through his dark designs. Assembling a conclave of reverend doctors on one occasion at Madrid, the King put it to them whether, with a good conscience, he could tolerate two religions in the Netherlands; and when, in the hope of pleasing him, his creatures answered that "he might, for the avoidance of a greater evil," trembling with rage the royal casuist exclaimed,—“I ask not if I can, but if I ought.” Then, throwing himself on his knees before a crucifix, and raising his hands towards heaven, he prayed for strength to pursue, as deadly enemies, all who did not regard that image with the same feelings as himself. Henceforward it is not too much to say that, simultaneously with his holy war on his Protestant and Hebrew subjects in Spain, the chief labour of Philip's life was to crush freedom of opinion in the Netherlands. This he really seems to have regarded as his mission in the present world; and for this, in the world to come, he appears never to have doubted that a God of infinite truth and benevolence had reserved a crown of glory. To this he directed all the resources of his false and pettifogging, but withal secretive and cunning mind. For this he wrote, with his own royal hand, despatches and documents enough to form a library,

and on this he spent treasures which the wealth of either Indies could not reimburse. For this he tasked the resources of his ablest politicians, his most renowned commanders, his most ruthless inquisitors; and for this, besides sending army after army of his own, he made a hasty peace with France, and, having failed to make an ally, for this he would fain have made a conquest of England and Elisabeth.

The means by which Philip and his myrmidons proceeded to carry out their savage purpose, the pen falters to record. Suffice it to say, that until the archives of Pandemonium shall be revealed, we believe that it will be impossible to find any parallel to the long-sustained cruelties which the husband of our bloody Mary inflicted on his hapless subjects in the Netherlands. But as the ordinary modes of execution did not stay the plague of heresy, monkish ingenuity suggested horrible refinements, some of which had never occurred to the Pagan persecutors. Numbers were buried alive; many were fastened by one foot to a gibbet, and left hanging head downwards to prolong their dying through days of misery; and others were suspended over fires so managed that life should be kept as long as possible in their scorched and writhing bodies. And as it struck the sovereign that the *éclat* of the martyr's crown might be a motive to constancy in public executions, he wrote to his inquisitors, recommending that their victims should be despatched in secret. Heretics, he advised, should be put to death in their dungeons at midnight, by binding their heads between their knees, and then slowly suffocating them in tubs of water.

In carrying out the sanguinary decrees of Philip, the main agents were the clergy and the Spanish soldiery. To say nothing of a gloomy creed and cruel times, the former were severed from human sympathy, and their kinder feelings were petrified by the enforcement of a de-humanizing celibacy. In a council which the Duchess of Parma convened as early as 1565, all the lawyers, nobles, and deputies from the estates, were in favour of repealing the death-penalty in cases of heresy, but the prelates and theological professors were unanimously and stoutly in its favour. Their opinion coincided with what the Archbishop of Cambray wrote to Cardinal Granvelle, regarding the tainted city of Valenciennes. "Now that the pot is uncovered, and the whole cookery known, we had best push forward and make an end of all the principal heretics, whether rich or poor, without regarding whether the city will be entirely ruined by such a course. Such an opinion I should declare openly, were it not that we of the ecclesiastical profession are accused of always crying out for blood." And just as an artificial caste severed the clergy from the common humanity, so race, language, and mu-

tual hatred severed the Spanish soldiers from the Hollanders. But one dismal effect of these familiar cruelties was, that all hearts grew hard, except those which the grace of God kept tender. Richard Willemson, a worthy burgess of Asperen, and an Anabaptist, was chased by an officer of justice. It was a winter day, and he fled across the ice. The frozen surface, however, was so thin, that the fugitive had the utmost difficulty in crossing, and his pursuer fell through. Perceiving his danger, Willemson returned, and at the risk of his own life saved his enemy. Touched with such generosity, the officer would have gladly let his prisoner go; but the burgomaster, who witnessed the occurrence, called out, "Fulfil your oath," and the good Christian was led away to a fiery martyrdom.

During the eighteen years that Torquemada was inquisitor-general in Spain, 10,220 individuals were burned alive in that kingdom, and 97,321 were punished with infamy, confiscation of property, or perpetual imprisonment. The number of victims in the Netherlands, during the reign of Philip and his father, was enormous, although it is difficult to believe that they could extend to a hundred thousand, as is often stated. But although they had mounted to a million, the royal director-general of these butcheries would not have quailed nor held his hand. Undaunted by a report from his darling Alva, that immediately after Holy Week it would be needful to proceed with eight hundred executions, the king continued to write needless letters of encouragement to the "Council of Blood," nerving them to a work equally acceptable to the court of Madrid, to his Holiness, and to Heaven; and whilst his most Christian majesty was not engaged in planning a private assassination or superintending an *auto-da-fé*, he was regaled with ample details of torture and slaughter from his northern dominions. At last, in 1568, these horrors culminated. On the 16th of February in that year, a sentence issued from the Holy Office, condemning to death as heretics all the inhabitants of the Netherlands. Ten days afterwards the king issued the death-warrant of his subjects, and with the exception of persons specially named, ordered it to be carried into instant execution!

Philip was not mad. He was only a fanatic in purple, a Dominic who, instead of a cowl, wore a crown: and in that age of the world (perhaps even in the present) such men were possibilities. In Spain he was perfectly successful. Before he died there was not in all that magnificent peninsula an avowed Protestant left alive. And in the Netherlands he might have also succeeded, had not Providence raised up an instrument to arrest his progress and baffle his designs.

William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, was the wealthiest and

most considerable of the chiefs of the Netherlands. Seven years younger than Philip, he was brought up in the court of Philip's father, and as a boy and an imperial page, his precocious astuteness had not escaped the penetrating eye of the Emperor. At his abdication Charles addressed the estates, leaning on the shoulder of the youthful prince, and for his son and successor solicited the good offices of one likely to prove so powerful a subject. These good offices were at first zealously accorded, and would doubtless have been continued had it not been for an incident which opened betimes the eyes of Orange. After the treaty of Château Cambresis, he was one of three who remained for a short period at the court of France as hostages; and one day riding forth with Henry II. to hunt in the forest of Vincennes, they got detached from the party. As they ambled on together, the king began to talk of the scheme which he and his brother of Spain had so much at heart. William was too good a pupil of old Charles to shew that the scheme was all new to him, and by preserving a prudent silence he gathered its leading features from his communicative companion. He found that the two sovereigns had joined together for the extirpation of heresy in their several dominions, as a prelude to its extirpation in Europe, and that the plot was to be inaugurated by a massacre on the plan of the "Sicilian Vespers," in France. By giving no hint to the French monarch that he had ever heard one word of this before, William shewed that he could keep a secret; and from the use which he made of the information, people are now pretty well agreed that Henry could not have chosen a better confidant.

For although at that period a thorough Roman Catholic, William differed from his royal master in his views of persecution. He thought it hard that peaceful and honest citizens should be put to death for their religious opinions. He was determined that, wherever his own influence extended, there should be liberty of conscience; and as he was soon afterwards appointed Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, and Friesland, he steadfastly withstood the introduction into these provinces of Philip's sanguinary edicts.

In these pages, justice has already been done to the political services of the great founder of the Dutch Republic,\* and to estimate aright his personal character would require fuller details than our space permits. But never was a great part so faultlessly sustained, never was a noble destiny so splendidly fulfilled. And like all kindred instances, that distinction was earned and that destiny was achieved in beautiful unconsciousness. William

---

\* *North British Review*, vol. xxiii. p. 422, *et seq.*

of Orange did not seek great things for himself, and he did not foresee the great things which were in store for his family and his people; but he did his duty, and by doing that, he saved his country and made his name immortal.

At first it was good feeling, patriotism, dislike to foreign domination, a horror of persecution, which enlisted the Prince of Orange in his country's quarrel. But as the contest grew graver, and his own position more critical, higher considerations became familiar to his thoughts, and acquaintance with the men and their teaching gradually brought him over to the views of the Reformers: so that the contest into which he entered as a generous Catholic, he prolonged with the personal earnestness and life-or-death anxiety of a convert and a Calvinist. The poor Hollanders he found as sheep without a shepherd, and, as they themselves knew full well, sheep doomed to the slaughter. Throughout the population there had been enkindled from on high an intense spiritual earnestness, and to hear the Scriptures read and expounded they rushed in crowds to the conventicle, and were then hurried in unresisting droves to the place of execution. Even the Catholics detested the Spanish tyranny, but although the population was in a state of virtual revolt, those who should have been heads of the people had neither the statesmanship nor the strength of purpose demanded by the crisis, and the best-concerted measures were sure to be marred by bacchanalians like Brederode, and Quixotes like Egmont. But mortified as he was by the defection of the faithless, and traversed by the blunders of the loyal, William kept his own counsel, and, what was still more difficult, he never looked disconsolate. Throwing into the popular cause all his fortune, which was very great, he brought to it the still more precious contribution of great sagacity and implicit faith in God; and consequently, just as he was not so elated by temporary success, neither was he so depressed by partial defeat as men of feebler piety or more limited experience. Like others of his family in after ages, he was minutely acquainted with the mainsprings which moved the various courts of Europe; and more especially as regarded his personal enemy, Philip, he had taken means to keep himself better acquainted with the monarch's plans than his private secretary, and almost as well as his father confessor, and in any case where more particular knowledge was wanting, it was safe to assume that Philip's designs were the exact opposite of Philip's assertions.

Inspired by such leadership, and roused to frenzy by unprecedented oppressions, in the year 1566 commenced the revolt of the Netherlands, a revolution which for the first time has found a worthy recital in English from the pen of a transatlantic

historian. To follow Mr. Motley all along is, of course, impossible; but in justice to an author whose work we have read with such lively interest, we must give brief specimens of his powers of narration.

A turning-point in the contest was the sieges of Haarlem and Leyden. With its feeble ramparts the former held out seven months. Its small garrison of Scotch and Dutch could hardly have made good the place a single day; but every citizen became a soldier, and waxing valiant in defence of their religion and their homes, hundreds of women shouldered a musket, and regularly wrought in the trenches. At last the Spaniards, after losing twelve thousand soldiers, sent a flag of truce, and offered a pardon to all within the walls if they would surrender the town. The terms were accepted, and the Spaniards admitted; but, on the fearful principle that no faith need be kept with heretics, they were no sooner masters of the place than they proceeded to a massacre of the more obnoxious inhabitants. Four executioners were installed, and all the soldiers who were not Germans, all the Protestant ministers, and many of the chief citizens were beheaded, till, at last, the executioners were so exhausted that the remaining victims were tied two and two together, and thrown into the lake. "Philip was lying dangerously ill at the wood of Segovia when the happy tidings arrived. The account, minutely detailed by Alva, acted like magic. The blood of twenty-three hundred of his fellow-creatures, coldly murdered by his orders in a single city, proved for the sanguinary monarch the elixir of life: he drank and was refreshed."

Meanwhile, the siege of Leyden was advancing. When summoned to surrender, the Dutch commandant had replied that, when provisions failed they would devour their left hands, reserving their right to defend their liberty. It almost looked as if they would be driven to fulfil this dreadful vow: for seven weeks a loaf of bread was not to be seen within the town.

"Bread, maltcake, horse-flesh, had entirely disappeared, dogs, cats, rats, and other vermin were esteemed luxuries. A small number of cows, kept as long as possible for their milk, remained; but a few were killed from day to day, and distributed in minute proportions, hardly sufficient to support life among the famishing population. Starving wretches swarmed daily around the shambles where the cattle were slaughtered, contending for any morsel which might fall, and lapping eagerly the blood as it ran along the pavement; while the hides, chopped and boiled, were greedily devoured. Women and children, all day long, were seen searching gutters and dunghills for morsels of food, which they disputed fiercely with the famishing dogs. The green leaves were stripped from the trees, every living herb was converted into human food; but these expedi-

ents could not avert starvation. The daily mortality was frightful,—infants starved to death on the maternal breasts, which famine had parched and withered; mothers dropped dead in the streets, with their dead children in their arms. In many a house the watchmen, in their rounds, found a whole family of corpses,—father, mother, and children, side by side; for a disorder called the plague, naturally engendered of hardship and suffering, now came, as if in kindness, to abridge the agony of the people. The pestilence stalked at noonday through the city, and the doomed inhabitants fell like grass beneath its scythe. From six thousand to eight thousand human beings sunk before this scourge alone."

At this time the Prince of Orange lay sick of a fever at Rotterdam. Still, with the States-General he concerted means for the relief of the beleaguered city. The last resort of Hollanders at bay, it was resolved to break down the sea-dykes, thus flooding the country, and sending a flotilla of 200 boats to the succour of the garrison. Favoured by equinoctial gales, which poured in an uncommon tide, this fleet arrived on October 2d at Lammen, a fortress commanding the approach to Leyden, bristling with artillery, and swarming with Spaniards. So formidable was it, however, that Admiral Boisot lay all day at a respectful distance, and reconnoitring, with a view to storm it, if possible, on the morrow:—

"Meantime, the citizens had grown wild with expectation. A dove had been despatched by Boisot, informing them of his precise position, and a number of citizens accompanied the burgomaster at nightfall toward the tower of Hengist. 'Yonder,' cried the magistrate, stretching out his hand towards Lammen, 'yonder, behind that fort, are bread and meat, and brethren in thousands. Shall all this be destroyed by the Spanish guns, or shall we rush to the rescue of our friends?' 'We will tear the fortress to fragments with our teeth and nails,' was the reply, 'before the relief, so long expected, shall be wrested from us.' It was resolved that a sortie, in conjunction with the operations of Boisot, should be made against Lammen with the earliest dawn. Night descended upon the scene, a pitch-dark night, full of anxiety to the Spaniards, to the armada, to Leyden.

"Strange sights and sounds occurred at different moments to bewilder the anxious sentinels. A long procession of lights issuing from the fort was seen to flit across the black face of the waters, in the dead of night, and the whole of the city wall, between the Cow-gate and the Tower of Burgundy, fell with a loud crash. The horror-struck citizens thought that the Spaniards were upon them at last; the Spaniards imagined the noise to indicate a desperate sortie of the citizens. Everything was vague and mysterious.

"Day dawned at length, after the feverish night, and the Admiral prepared for the assault. Within the fortress reigned a death-like

stillness, which inspired a sickening suspicion. Had the city, indeed, been carried in the night; had the massacre already commenced; had all this labour and audacity been expended in vain? Suddenly a man was descried, wading breast-high through the water from Lammen towards the fleet, while, at the same time, one solitary boy was seen to wave his cap from the summit of the fort. After a moment of doubt the happy mystery was solved. The Spaniards had fled panic-struck, during the darkness. Their position would still have enabled them, with firmness, to frustrate the enterprise of the patriots; but the hand of God, which had sent the ocean and the tempest to the deliverance of Leyden, had struck her enemies with terror likewise.

"The lights which had been seen moving during the night were the lanterns of the retreating Spaniards, and the boy who was now waving his triumphant signal from the battlements, had alone witnessed the spectacle. So confident was he in the conclusion to which it led him, that he had volunteered, at daybreak, to go thither all alone. The magistrates, fearing a trap, hesitated for a moment to believe the truth, which soon, however, became quite evident. Valdez, flying himself from Leyderdorp, had ordered Colonel Borgia to retire with all his troops from Lammen. Thus the Spaniards had retreated at the very moment that an extraordinary accident had laid bare a whole side of the city for their entrance. The noise of the wall, as it fell, only inspired them with fresh alarm; for they believed that the citizens had sallied forth in the darkness, to aid the advancing flood in the work of destruction. All obstacles being now removed, the fleet of Boisot swept by Lammen, and entered the city on the 3d of October (1574.) Leyden was relieved.

"The quays were lined with the famishing population as the fleet rowed through the canals, every human being who could stand coming forth to greet the preservers of the city. Bread was thrown from every vessel among the crowd. The poor creatures who for two months had tasted no wholesome human food, and who had literally been living within the jaws of death, snatched eagerly the blessed gift, at last too liberally bestowed. Many choked themselves to death in the greediness with which they devoured their bread; others became ill with the effects of plenty thus suddenly succeeding starvation;—but these were isolated cases, a repetition of which was prevented. The Admiral, stepping ashore, was welcomed by the magistracy, and a solemn procession was immediately formed. Magistrates and citizens, wild Zeelanders, emaciated burgher-guards, sailors, soldiers, women, children, nearly every living person within the walls, all repaired without delay to the great church,—stout Admiral Boisot leading the way. The starving and heroic city, which had been so firm in its resistance to an earthly king, now bent itself in humble gratitude before the King of kings. After prayers, the whole vast congregation joined in the thanksgiving hymn. Thousands of voices raised the song, but few were able to carry it to its conclusion, for the universal emotion, deepened by the music, became too full for utterance. The hymn was

abruptly suspended, while the multitude wept like children."—Vol. ii. pp. 574-577.

Never has there been a contest, in all its features, comparable to that war of liberation. With a single truce, and a few intervals of exhaustion, it lasted eighty years. It was a fight of patriotism and piety against tyranny and superstition. It was the fight of a little nation against the greatest nation then existing. And it was fought single-handed. A little help occasionally came from Germany or France; but, through the policy of Elizabeth and the cowardice of James, England usually stood aloof. But still, few and unbefriended, the stout-hearted Hollanders fought on, and when, in 1648, the Treaty of Munster was signed, the Republic of the Seven United Provinces was a first-rate power and the freest country in Europe; whilst Spain, impoverished, crippled, and humbled in the eyes of all Europe, was rapidly sinking to one of the basest of kingdoms. For long it was Holland's proud office to arbitrate in the quarrels of kingdoms, and her prerogative still prouder to offer an asylum and a home to those whom faith or love of freedom had made exiles from other lands,—witness the banished Huguenots of France, the persecuted Covenanters of Scotland and Non-conformists of England. To the present hour the handsomely endowed French, Scotch, and English Churches of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and the Hague, are a memorial of the magnificent hospitality and noble toleration of that brave republic; whilst their kindness to the outcasts of Israel has been rewarded by a mercantile prosperity more lasting and more solid than any martial glory. The refuge so freely offered to the exiles of Christendom, was as strong as it was liberal, and our own sea-service can hardly match the Dutchman's "deeds of naval daring." On one occasion during the Spanish war, the States' exchequer was exhausted, and having no nearer source of supply, they sent out an expedition to the West Indies direct, and capturing the famous money-fleet of their enemy, brought home wealth sufficient to make their exchequer overflow. It was a few years later, when, in the Battle of the Downs, the great Van Tromp sank and captured fifty Spanish men-of-war, and annihilated for ever the maritime supremacy of the republic's mortal foe. In 1656, the Swedes had nearly overwhelmed the Danes, when the Dutch flew to the assistance of their allies. The Sound was guarded by a Swedish fleet much larger than the Dutch, and from a tower in Copenhagen, and from the castle of Kronenberg, the two hostile kings watched the issue of the fight. Sick, and suffering mortal anguish, the gallant Opdam was carried up and lay on deck issuing the needful commands till he gained a glorious victory, and raised the siege of Copenhagen. Nor can we well forget how, in the soft

and ignoble days of Charles the Second, De Ruyter and De Witt captured Sheerness, sailed into the Medway, cut through the guard-chain under a heavy fire, and besides burning various first-rates, carried off the Royal Charles of 100 guns.

Whoso is wise will understand these things. They teach us the inspiring influence of a scriptural creed, and how secure the nation is, and how stately it may grow, which puts its trust in God. Holland was nothing, till all of a sudden the Gospel made it sublime. The Gospel taught the Hollanders the worth of their souls, and their direct accountability to the Most High ; and there is nothing which makes a man or a people so free as a sense of responsibility to the King of kings, and nothing which makes either so brave as the abiding remembrance, "Thou, God, seest me." These old Dutchmen were firm believers, and that made them brave warriors ; they were God-fearing Christians, and that made them freemen whom no tyrant could enslave. Into the calculations of their statesmen an unusual element entered ;—they thought of eternity, and seeking first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, they were ready for bold strokes at which common heroism falters. Rather than deny Christ's name they could seriously prepare for a national migration to another continent, and rather than see it again profaned by the footsteps of Antichrist, they could make up their minds to break down embankments, the work of industrious centuries, and restore to the bosom of Ocean, still free and unpolluted, the dear land of their fathers.

For such a people God himself interposed. Their public fasts and their prayers were more successful than their embassies to Paris and London, and the help which came from heaven was more decisive than all their levies. Oft might the forlorn Hollander say, "There is none that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God ;" but by a series of marvellous interpositions which brought to remembrance Gideon's host and Sennacherib's army, the Lord subdued their enemies under them ; and in the great churches, victors, as devout as they were valiant, sang, "For His own right hand and His holy arm have gotten Him the victory."

The contrast between Protestantism and patriotism on the one side, and servility and superstition on the other, were strikingly displayed in the inverse progress of Belgium and Holland. In the days of Luther, Belgium was the mart of Europe, and the great focus of manufacturing industry ; but in those days Holland was still weak and poor. However, Holland embraced the Gospel, Belgium let it slip. Belgium submitted to the Pope and the Spaniard : loyal to the Bible and to the Lord of the conscience, Holland fought for civil and religious freedom, and

with a great price earned the blessing. And when Belgium was lamenting its dwindled commerce and its decaying industry; when the docks of Antwerp were shipless, and the houses in Ghent, Mechlin, and Bruges were tumbling into ruins; when the great traders had carried away their capital to happier lands, and wolves were prowling through the untilled fields of Flanders and Brabant; when the crushed and abject country produced no hero and no sage, and Louvain, which used to boast six thousand students, had become a mere factory of monks, a dormitory for drowsy friars,—the Dutch coast was expanding into one great harbour, and the Dutch merchant-navy was fast absorbing into itself the traffic of both hemispheres; the ocean was alive with Dutch fishermen, Dutch East Indiamen, Dutch men-of-war; the wharves of Rotterdam and Amsterdam were groaning with rich freights from Guinea and the Cape, as well as the Republic's vast possessions in either Indies and the Chinese seas; Van Tromp, De Ruyter, and De Witt were filling the ocean with their fame; Grotius was founding the science of international jurisprudence, and was shedding over abstrusest themes the charms of poetry, and the lights of universal knowledge: Boerhaave was expounding medicine and botany to the greatest crowd which ever flocked round an academic chair, and was receiving visits from kings and emperors: Leeuwenhoek was opening that path of microscopical research into which the present day has sent so many followers, and was pioneering the way for the modern science of animal physiology: Teniers, Rembrandt, and Paul Potter were adorning with the effusions of their matchless pencil the halls of wealthy guilds and the palaces of merchant princes: Cocceius, Marckius, De Moor, Spanheim, Vitranga, Venema, Witsius, those Justinians of theology, to whose systematizing labours the Protestant divine pays reverent homage, were raising their mighty monuments of Christian scholarship and studious industry: Cartwright, the English Puritan, was preaching at Middleburg; John Brown and Robert Fleming, the Scottish Covenanters, were labouring at Rotterdam; and Saurin, the refugee, was electrifying his French audience at the Hague; and whilst in the successful revolt from arbitrary power, subjects received a lesson which was soon to be copied by the English Commonwealth, and, at a later period, by the American Republic, the potentates of Christendom had opportunity to profit by the example of skilful statesmanship, military prowess, and personal virtue set before them in the most illustrious succession of patriot-princes the world has ever yielded,—to one of whom and to Holland Britain owes her glorious Revolution and her Protestant succession.

To Mr. Motley we tender our best thanks for his instructive

and spirit-stirring volumes. They bring the history down to 1584, and are thus, to all intents, a biography of the Great William,—“William the Silent,” as, in fond commemoration of his wise taciturnity in the forest of Vincennes, his countrymen love to call him, or as, perhaps, it would be less misunderstood amongst ourselves if we called him “William the Wary.” On his task, Mr. Motley has entered with the enthusiasm of which it is worthy, and his command of the Dutch language, and his research among records, Dutch and German, give a completeness to his view of William’s character lacking in some popular historians,—Mr. Prescott, for example, whose authorities are almost entirely Spanish, or Dutch through French translations. With the exception of Mr. Grattan’s concise and well-written summary, and Miss Davies’s painstaking and elaborate volumes, we are acquainted with no professed history of Holland in the English language; and there was not only room but great need for such a book as Mr. Motley has now produced. With the exception of a few galvanic twitches, which remind us of Carlyle and Carlyle’s Boston copyist, the style is excellent,—clear, vivid, eloquent; and the industry with which original sources have been investigated, and through which new light has been shed over many perplexed incidents and characters, entitles Mr. Motley to a high rank in the literature of an age peculiarly rich in history.

ART. V.—*Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers.*  
Second Edition. London, Moxon, 1856.

SAMUEL ROGERS was born on the 30th of July 1763, and died on the 18th of December 1855. What he was in himself, and what he did in the literature of his country during this unusually long life of ninety-three years, is tolerably well known. He first appeared as an author in the year 1786, when, at the age of twenty-three, he published *An Ode to Superstition, and some other Poems*. In 1792 he published his *Pleasures of Memory*, by which, and by a subsequent volume containing *An Epistle to a Friend and other Poems*, published in 1798, he established his place among the men of letters who adorned Britain in the closing decade of the eighteenth century. During a period of fourteen years he gave nothing new to the world, either to increase or to mar his reputation. In the course of this long interval of silence, he had changed his mode of life, by retiring from his hereditary business as a London banker, to enjoy, with the help of the ample wealth which that business had already secured for him, a leisure absolutely at the command of his private tastes. The house of Rogers in St. James's Place became a little paradise of the beautiful, where, amid pictures and other objects of art, collected with care and arranged with skill, the happy owner-nestled in fastidious ease, and sustained, through two whole generations of contemporaries, a character in which something of the Horace was blended with something of the Mæcenas. Till 1812, indeed, all but his intimate friends might have supposed that his muse was dead; but in that year he proved the contrary by adding to a republication of his earlier pieces his little poem of *Columbus*. He was then in his fiftieth year; but this was not to be the last of his literary appearances. Composed with the same laborious slowness, and polished line by line to the same degree of smoothness, his *Jacqueline* was published in 1814, and his *Human Life* in 1819. Finally, as the last, and much the longest of his productions, came his *Italy*, the first part of which was published in 1822, in the poet's sixtieth year, and the complete edition of which, illustrated, under the author's care, at an expense of ten thousand pounds, by Stothard, Prout, and Turner, did not appear till 1836. With the preparation of this exquisite book his literary career may be said to close. He still wrote an occasional copy of verses at the rate of a couplet in a week, and some of these trifles, including one written as late as his ninety-first year, are preserved in his collected works. But, upon the whole, it was in

his character as a superannuated poet, living on the reputation of his past performances, drawing the artists, and wits, and men of rank of a more modern age around him, dispensing among them the elegant hospitalities of his mansion, and entertaining them with his caustic talk and his reminiscences of the notable persons and events of former days, that he figured among us, or rather in a select portion of London society, during the last twenty years of his existence. He did many kind things, and said many bitter ones. Almost to the last year of his life he trudged about in the open air, and was pointed out in the parks, or in a box at the opera, as old Rogers. He used to give young men excellent advice, founded on his own experience, as to the best means of preserving their health and spirits. Altogether he was a remarkable relic of the past; and an invitation to one of his breakfasts was valued as an opportunity of seeing and hearing much that could not be seen or heard elsewhere. There were a few persons who were specially intimate with him, and who cultivated his society as that of a diminutive patriarch, who had wisdom, or at least information, that would die with him. Among these was Mr. Dyce, the eminent editor and annotator of so many of our early English poets. The present selection from Mr. Dyce's memoranda of Rogers's "Table-Talk" may be regarded as the best record posterity is likely to have of the poet as he was in his old age, and apart from his poetry.

The "Table-Talk" will strengthen the opinion, which most people will have at any rate formed, that however considerable may have been Rogers's own literary merits, the chief interest in him arises from his social position combined with his longevity. Any man who lives ninety-three years is remarkable,—much more a poet who lives ninety-three years,—and more still, a poet who lives ninety-three years in the very centre of the social and literary activity of his country, and in possession of such means as enables him to be in cordial and even influential relations with it all. Ninety-three years! Why, it is no insignificant bit of the entire duration of the world! Seventy Samuel Rogerses, at this rate, might shake hands in an unbroken chain up to Adam; twenty would connect us with the commencement of the Christian era; nine would take us back, with room to spare, to the date of the Norman conquest; and three linked together would reach into the age of Shakespeare. What Samuel Rogers lived through, therefore, between 1763 and 1855, was, measuring by bulk alone, a seventieth part of all that has taken place on the earth since first there were human beings upon it; it was a twentieth part of all modern history; it was a ninth part of all that Mr. Macaulay would include in the truly national History of England; and it was about a third part of pro-

perly British history, or of the history of England and Scotland since their union. It is not often that we have an opportunity of taking up in our hands such a bit of universal time, pierced through, so to speak, by one remarkable life, visibly holding it together from end to end, and enabling us to turn it round and round while we examine it and endeavour to become acquainted with it. Feeling this, we mean, for our own part, to speak more of the times of Samuel Rogers than of Samuel Rogers himself; believing, however, that what we *have* to say about the man will have fully more significance if said in context with his relations. Only, in mercy to our readers, we shall not attempt to lift up by so slender a wire of connexion, the whole of that seventieth part of universal time, which it does, in a sense, hold together, but shall content ourselves with that more limited mass of ninety years of purely British circumstance which the man lived through consciously and sensitively, or, at most, with that coeval mass of general European facts which was within the geographical horizon, and, consequently, within the table-talk range of a rich and cultivated poet, living in St. James's Place, London, and digesting all into idea and reminiscence.

When Rogers opened his eyes in Stoke-Newington, and his mother could think of nothing else for looking at him, people round about who had not babies, and even his banker-father, when he went to the city on business and forgot the baby, were talking about a great Peace of Paris then just concluded,—a peace fully as important as that which we now, several months after the death of the said baby at the age of ninety-three, are also talking about so busily, under the same name. By *that* Peace of Paris, the Seven Years' War was terminated; Frederick, as the great man of his age, was set free to rule over Prussia in quiet glory; and Britain, his solitary ally, which had subsidized him, and fought on his side both with armies and fleets against France, Austria, Spain, Russia, and Sweden combined, found herself retiring from the struggle with a whole retinue of new colonies and dependencies acquired during it,—India hers by the conquests of Clive, Canada hers by the victory of Wolfe, a vast region to the left of the Mississippi added to her former American possessions south of Canada, several new West Indian islands hers, and more pieces of the African coast made over to her than she knew what to do with. This, in fact, was the epoch when Britain ceased to be a mere kingdom, and became an empire. The change had been the work of one man—Chatham. He it was who, called to chief ministry at the close of the reign of George II., while the Seven Years' War was going on, had breathed his electric magnanimity into the counsels of the nation, had sent his soul abroad in

our ships and regiments, and, clinging to the great Frederick as a kindred spirit with whom Britain ought to rise or fall, had caused Britain to rise and not to fall, and, for the first time since Marlborough and his victories, had roused her to deeds that the world called splendid. Two years before the Peace of which we speak, however,—George III., at the age of twenty-four, having, in the meantime, succeeded his grandfather on the throne,—Chatham had retired from office, to make way for meaner men. At the time of Rogers's birth and infancy, the Bute influence was paramount at the court of the young sovereign, though Grenville had succeeded Bute as the ostensible minister. Then, in rapid succession during the next seven years, came the first Rockingham ministry, the second but merely nominal Chatham ministry, the Grafton ministry, and the North ministry,—the last of which, coming into office in 1770, when Rogers was in his seventh year, remained in office till 1782, when he was verging on nineteen. During all these successive ministries, Britain was under the curse of a peddling politics. The impulse of the first Chatham administration still, to some extent, remained in her,—personified, above all, in Warren Hastings, who, left to himself in the East, was completing, on his own responsibility, the conquest of India for his countrymen. But, in other respects, the age of political greatness was gone, and that of mere Parliamentary polemics had succeeded. The nation felt this, and was uniformly hostile to the King and his successive ministries. What, in fact, were the questions which then agitated Britain? They were the questions of "Wilkes and Liberty," and of the discontent of the American colonies. The first wretched question had begun when Rogers was in his cradle,—for it was precisely in 1763 that Wilkes was called to account for the seditious No. 45 of the *North Briton*; but it was not over when Rogers had reached his boyhood. During the first nine or ten years of his life, the nation was talking incessantly of Wilkes, Wilkes,—this name also was the watchword of the Parliamentary opposition; and it was in the midst of this precious controversy that Junius came upon the scene, wearing his iron mask. The only relief from the Wilkes question was the question of American rebellion. Begun in 1764, when the taxation of the Colonies was resolved on by the Grenville ministry, this question grew and grew, intertwining itself with that of Wilkes, until actually in 1775, under the dogged ministry of North, the Colonies did take up arms. Then the Wilkes question was finally engulfed, and the war of American Independence became the all-engrossing topic. At the commencement of this war, Rogers, as a boy of twelve, was old enough to feel an interest in it. At all events,

when, after lasting eight years, with little else than the mad Gordon Riots of 1780 to distract attention from it, the war was concluded in 1783, by the reluctant consent of George III. to acknowledge the independence of the Colonies, Rogers, as a clever youth of twenty, could appreciate the importance of that event, and of the consequent organization of the Transatlantic Republic under the presidency of Washington. During the year or two that followed, there was little in British politics to interest Rogers or anybody else. In 1784, Pitt the younger, at the age of twenty-five, came into power, ending the two years of confusion which had intervened since the resignation of North, and full of schemes of Parliamentary Reform, and of other great measures such as might befit the policy of one who was determined to be remembered in British history as a great finance minister. Then in 1786 came the episode of the trial of Warren Hastings, with all its accompaniments of Indian debate and reform. It was into the midst of this contest of the best rhetoric of the time against its best genius of action, that Rogers ventured to send forth his first tiny volume of elegant verse. A year or two more, and, lo! a convulsion which shook the world, and in relation to which, aught that Rogers or any other versifier could do was a million times more irrelevant! Pitt, too, was out in his calculations. No more talk of Parliamentary reform, no more dreams of fine pacific administration; nothing but war to the death with the Revolution and with France! The same terrible year, 1792, which roused the "heaven-born minister," and made him the soul of the Coalition formed against the Revolution, saw the publication of the *Pleasures of Memory*; and little wonder if, during the next three-and-twenty years, the Muses were disposed to hold their peace. During these three-and-twenty years, in the course of which Rogers passed through the entire period of his full manhood, from his thirtieth to his fifty-third year, what a series of European changes! The Revolution runs its course under the Convention and Robespierre; the Directory succeeds; Bonaparte supersedes the Directory, and, first as Consul, and then as Emperor, fills the universe with his name, until he is struck down at Waterloo. To the same period belongs the annihilation of Poland (1794), and all the various trains of consequences, affecting each country in particular, which flowed from the military activity of Napoleon. As regards Britain, her history, during this period, ran ostensibly in the usual channel of successive ministries. Pitt remained in office till 1801, throwing the resources of Britain into the contest with France, adding to our conquests in India through the Governors-General whom he sent out, and, as his final act before resigning, accomplishing

the Irish Union. This also was the great period of the Parliamentary eloquence of Fox, and Burke, and Sheridan. Then, in the short peace, came the ministry of Addington; and then, from 1804 to 1806, the second ministry of Pitt, illustrated by Nelson's last victory, and closed by Pitt's death. The Fox-and-Grenville ministry came next, proving that even the Whigs could not make peace with Napoleon; then, from 1807 to 1812, came the Tory ministry of Perceval, and the first exploits of Wellington in the Peninsula; and then, on Perceval's death, the memorable rule, which seemed as if it would be eternal, of Liverpool and Castlereagh. When Waterloo and the Congress of Vienna had relieved this ministry from the cares of war, and set the nation afloat, with but 800 millions of debt to impede her progress, on a long voyage of peace and commerce, the Muses began to breathe again. Other poets, indeed, had been prolific even during the war, and the interests of literature had been abundantly vindicated by the appearance of such organs as the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*; but Rogers had only twice, and in both cases modestly enough, intruded himself on public attention, while the war lasted. The Liverpool-and-Castlereagh ministry, carrying on the history of the country during the first seven years of the Peace—that is, through the whole of the Regency, and two years into the reign of George IV.—carried Rogers on to his sixtieth year, and counted his *Human Life* and the first part of his *Italy* among its literary fruits. This was the day of conspiracies, corresponding societies, prosecutions for sedition, and the Queen Caroline agitation. The Liverpool-Canning rule succeeded, with its more liberal foreign policy, consummating itself in the premiership of Canning, when hopes ran so high (1827). In one short year Canning dies, Goderich does his best, and we have the Iron Duke and Peel for our chief statesmen. Catholic emancipation is wrung even from the man of iron; but George IV. dies, and William IV. accedes, and there is still no chance of that Parliamentary Reform which forty-five years before Pitt himself had promised. Again, however, comes the blast of Revolution from France, (July 1830;) Earl Grey and his Whigs supersede Wellington and his Tories; and there is the two years' struggle with the Lords for the Reform-Bill. At the age of seventy, Rogers sees the happy arrival of the nation in its promised Canaan, through the carrying of this Bill, (1832;) and he sets about the illustration of his *Italy*. Alas! the old man lives to hear it confessed that what seemed Canaan was but a political *mirage*. Not to speak of sixteen years of continued alteration between Whig and Conservative ministries,—an era marked by the notoriety of such names as Peel, Brougham, O'Connell, Melbourne, Lord John

Russell, and by such events as Irish agitation, the accession of Queen Victoria, Rebellion in Canada, the Disruption of the Scottish Church, wars in India and China, and Corn-Law Repeal,—Rogers lives to hear, in his eighty-sixth year, of a third outburst of revolution in France, and to mark its effects in thrones again tottering, peoples again shouting, and armies again marching and countermarching all over Europe. Nay, beyond even 1848 and its changes, the old man lives to mark changes following changes;—a new Napoleon on the throne of France, an Anglo-French alliance, and a coalition of European powers to arrest the growth of Russia, and prevent the dismemberment of Turkey. He hears of the death of Nicholas, of the battles of Alma and Inkerman, of British valour proved, without a Wellington to order it, in new fields. At length, fatigued with very excess of life, and not waiting to hear of that Pacification of Paris, of which people were about to talk as vigorously as they had talked of a former Pacification of Paris when he was born, he shut his languid eyes, and bade farewell to the world.

Surely, in the political order alone, this was a sufficient medley and duration of facts for one man to have lived through. Not a man of strife or action, almost his only connexion with them consisted in the fact that he did live through them. *He* lived while *they* happened; and even if he had not lived they would have happened all the same, or with an amount of difference so infinitesimally small that we have no calculus subtle enough to appreciate it. To him it was all so much object and incident flashing and flitting past, causing sensation after sensation, and entering as sensation into the current of his mental life; but no reflex energy, no effort in return, no stroke back, did it or could it provoke from him. For that, the Chathams, the Pitts, and the Wellingtons, were the men. They moved, and fought, and laboured; while to a man like Rogers all that happened was occasion only for so much *reminiscence*, or, at most, for so much *idea*, *doctrine*, or *belief*. Still, as each man's reminiscences and beliefs, occasioned by what he has lived through, depend on his circumstances and character—as the reminiscences and beliefs of a Wordsworth, for example, living through the same period as a Rogers, and on the whole as passively, would still not be the same as those of a Rogers—it is interesting enough, in connexion with the life of Rogers, to inquire what sorts of reminiscences he had of the public affairs of his time, and into what sort of doctrines or beliefs his observations of the public affairs of his time had shaped themselves.

Here are a few of Rogers's reminiscences of public men and affairs during his long life.

*Reminiscence of Wilkes.*—"One morning, when I was a lad, Wilkes came into our banking-house to solicit my father's vote. My father happened to be out, and I, as his representative, spoke to Wilkes. At parting, Wilkes shook hands with me; and I felt proud of it for a week after. He was quite as ugly, and squinted as much, as his portraits make him; but he was very gentlemanly in appearance and manners. I think I see him at this moment walking through the crowded streets of the city as chamberlain, on his way to Guildhall, in a scarlet coat, military boots, and a bag-wig,—the hackney-coachmen in vain calling out to him, 'A coach, your honour!'"

*Reminiscence of the Gordon Riots.*—"When I was a lad, I recollect seeing a whole cartful of young girls, in dresses of various colours, on their way to be executed at Tyburn. They had all been condemned, on one indictment, for having been concerned in (that is, perhaps, for having been spectators of) the burning of some houses during Lord George Gordon's riots. It was quite horrible. Greville was present at one of the trials consequent on those riots, and heard several boys sentenced, to their own excessive amazement, to be hanged. 'Never,' said Greville, with great *naïveté*, 'did I see boys cry so.'"

*Recollection of France before the Revolution.*—"My first visit to France was in company with Boddington, not long before the Revolution began. When we arrived at Calais we saw both ladies and gentlemen walking on the pier with small fox-muffs. While we were dining there a poor monk came into the room and asked us for charity; and Boddington annoyed me much by saying to him, 'Il faut travailler.' The monk bowed meekly and withdrew. Nothing would satisfy Boddington but that we should ride on horseback the first stage from Calais; and, accordingly, to the great amusement of the inn-keeper and chamber-maid, we were furnished with immense jack-boots and hoisted upon our steeds. When we reached Paris, Lafayette gave us a general invitation to dine with him every day. At his table we once dined with about a dozen persons, (among them the Duke de la Rochefoucauld, Condorcet, &c.,) most of whom afterwards came to an untimely end."

*Fox in his youth.*—"Fox, (in his earlier days, I mean,) Sheridan, Fitzpatrick, &c., led such a life! Lord Tankerville assured me that he has played cards with Fitzpatrick at Brookes's from ten o'clock at night till near six o'clock the next afternoon, a waiter standing by to tell them 'whose deal it was,' they being too sleepy to know. After losing large sums at hazard, Fox would go home,—not to destroy himself, as his friends sometimes feared, but—to sit down quietly and read Greek. . . . When I became acquainted with Fox he had given up that kind of life entirely, and resided in the most perfect sobriety and regularity at St. Anne's Hill."

*What Fox said of Burke.*—"Fox once said to me that 'Burke was a most impracticable person, a most unmanageable colleague,—that he never would support any measure, however convinced he might be in his heart of its utility, if it had been first proposed by

another;' and he once used these very words, 'After all, Burko was a d—d wrong-headed fellow, through his whole life jealous and obstinate.'"

*Pitt and Dundas.*—"During his boyhood Pitt was very weakly; and his physician, Addington, (Lord Sidmouth's father,) ordered him to take port-wine in large quantities; the consequence was, that, when he grew up, he could not do without it. Lord Grenville has seen him swallow a bottle of port in tumblerfuls before going to the House. This, together with his habit of eating late suppers, (indigestible cold veal-pies, &c.,) helped undoubtedly to shorten his life. Huskisson, speaking to me of Pitt, said that his hands shook so much that, when he helped himself to salt, he was obliged to support the right hand with the left. Stothard the painter happened to be one evening at an inn on the Kent road when Pitt and Dundas put up there on their way from Walmer. Next morning, as they were stepping into their carriage, the waiter said to Stothard, 'Sir, do you observe these two gentlemen?'—"Yes," he replied; 'and I know them to be Mr. Pitt and Mr. Dundas.'—"Well, sir, how much wine do you suppose they drank last night?" Stothard could not guess. 'Seven bottles, sir.'"

*The Prince of Wales.*—"When he (Erskine) had a house at Hampstead he entertained the very best company. I have dined there with the Prince of Wales—the only time I ever had any conversation with his Royal Highness. On that occasion the prince was very agreeable and familiar. Among other anecdotes which he told us of Lord Thurlow I remember two. The first was:—Thurlow once said to the prince, 'Sir, your father will continue to be a popular king as long as he continues to go to church every Sunday, and to be faithful to that ugly woman your mother; but you, sir, will never be popular.'"

*Lord Nelson.*—"Lord Nelson was a remarkably kind-hearted man. I have seen him spin a teetotum with his *one* hand a whole evening, for the amusement of some children. I heard him once during dinner utter many bitter complaints (which Lady Hamilton vainly attempted to check) of the way he had been treated at court that forenoon: the queen had not condescended to take the slightest notice of him. In truth, Nelson was hated at court; they were jealous of his fame."

*Anecdote of Napoleon.*—"I'll tell you an anecdote of Napoleon, which I had from Talleyrand. 'Napoleon,' said Talleyrand, 'was at Boulogne with the army of England, when he received intelligence that the Austrians, under Mack, were at Ulm. "If it had been mine to place them," exclaimed Napoleon, "I should have placed them there." In a moment the army was on the march, and he at Paris. I attended him to Strasburg. We were there at the house of the *préfet*, and no one in the room but ourselves, when Napoleon was suddenly seized with a fit, foaming at the mouth: he cried, "*Fermez la porte!*" and then lay senseless on the floor. I bolted the door. Presently Berthier knocked. "*On ne peut pas entrer.*" Afterwards Josephine knocked, to whom I addressed the same words. Now, what a situa-

tion would mine have been if Napoleon had died ! But he recovered in about half an hour. Next morning, by daybreak, he was in his carriage ; and within sixty hours the Austrian army had capitulated. ”

*Sayings of Wellington.*—“ Speaking to me of Bonaparte, the Duke of Wellington remarked, that in one respect he was superior to all the generals who had ever existed. ‘ Was it,’ I asked, ‘ in the management and skilful arrangement of his troops ? ’ ‘ No,’ answered the Duke ; ‘ it was in his power of concentrating such vast masses of men,—a most important point in the art of war.’—‘ I have found,’ said the Duke, ‘ that raw troops, however inferior to the old ones in manœuvring, are far superior to them in downright hard fighting with the enemy ; at Waterloo, the young ensigns and lieutenants, who had never before seen a battle, rushed to meet death as if they had been playing at cricket.’

*Lord Castlereagh.*—“ Lord Grenville has more than once said to me at Dropmore, ‘ What a frightful mistake it was to send such a person as Lord Castlereagh to the Congress of Vienna !—a man who was so ignorant that he did not know the map of Europe ; and who could be won over to make any concessions by only being asked to breakfast with the Emperor.’ ”

*William IV.*—“ Once, when in company with William the Fourth, I quite forgot that it is against all etiquette to ask a sovereign about his health ; and on his saying to me, ‘ Mr. Rogers, I hope you are well,’ I replied, ‘ Very well, I thank your Majesty : *I trust your Majesty is quite well also.*’ Never was a king in greater confusion ; he didn’t know where to look, and stammered out, ‘ Yes,—yes,—only a little rheumatism.’ ”

From these specimens of Rogers’s recollections of the public men and events of his time, it will be seen that they were not of a kind to be of much use in history. They are the agreeable and lively reminiscences of a man of light nature, hanging on the skirts of his time, but without any deep interest in what was going on, without much reverence for the personages whose actions were filling the ear of the world, and without even such a rich sense of the humorous and the picturesque as was possessed by many of his literary contemporaries whose lives were equally passive. They are the mere dinner-table gossip of a man who had been much in society, and had picked up stray *ana* and anecdotes, but who had all his life been deficient in that more profound kind of sociability which leads men to enter strongly into the emotions of their time, to make penetrating inquiries with a view to a more intimate understanding of the true causes and drift of events, and to represent to themselves everything that goes on distinctly, keenly, and emphatically. The reminiscences, for example, of a man like Scott, were far more rich and historically significant, and doubtless also far more numerous ; and those of a man like Wordsworth had a

deeper spirit of social speculation in them. Critics of the volume before us have also discerned in Rogers's anecdotes a vein of ill-nature and detraction which they think characteristic—a habit of recollecting precisely those unpleasant things about eminent men which one would rather not hear; as in Fox's posthumous character of Burke. We do not think, however, that there is more of this quality in Rogers's reminiscences than is almost inevitable in the gossip of a man who is neither an enthusiast nor a humourist. All second-rate gossip runs to scandal.

As regards the kind of fixed doctrine or belief produced in Rogers's mind by his ninety-three years of experience of public men and incidents, it is difficult to come to any conclusion from the style of his reminiscences. One belief he must have pretty well made his own before he had done with the world—a belief expressed once for all long ago, but which every one has to acquire for himself, and which is not usually acquired until one has long fought against it: "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun." If any man in our time might be supposed to have thoroughly made up his life to this belief, it was old Rogers at the end of his life. How, as he looked back on the long vista of his own past existence, so full of facts and surprises, of junctures recurring, of movements begun and concluded, of reverses and traverses, of calms and convulsions, of wrecked schemes and exploded enthusiasms, he must have smiled at the zeal of younger men blazing up into moral conflagration if but the pope's cat mewed when they had not expected it, and seeing "a crisis" in every threat of war, and every change of ministry! What can 1848 have been to him, or the Hungarian Insurrection, or Louis Napoléon's *coup d'état*, or the fall of the Aberdeen Cabinet, or the fall of Sebastopol? "My dear boy," he must have said to many a man of forty upon whom these things were producing an effect, "wait till you come to my time of life, and you will be a little cooler in your notions." And yet, with all this, Rogers must have been aware that things in the gross *had* gone through a regular process of change in his time; and that though, in a general sense, and as measured by a larger cycle, the thing that had been was the thing that still was, and the thing that was done was the thing that would be done, and there was no new thing under the sun; yet, in a more specific and narrow sense, there were many new things under the sun which that luminary had not looked down upon when he was first acquainted with it, and not a little *vice versa*. Through all that roaring sequence of Wilkesite agitations, and Napoleonic wars, and Castlereagh

administrations, and a hundred other mountains of fact and talk, each filling the firmament in its day from the solid floor of the earth upwards, there had been a small constant stream of social change or progress, quietly flowing underneath, and distilled drop by drop out of these very vaporous overhanging masses. Dying at the age of ninety-three, he had not left the world, and certainly he had not left Great Britain, precisely as he found it. Customs had changed, institutions had changed, ways of public action had changed. As a boy he could recollect seeing the head of a rebel, a black shapeless lump, stuck on a pole at Temple-Bar; he could recollect also, with many younger men, the weekly carts conveying criminals, at the rate of from ten to twenty every week in London alone, to the place of public execution; but ere he died all that was altered, and he could hear, on the occasion of every rare execution, philanthropy holding public meetings to denounce even that as brutality and barbarism. And this change in one department of our social procedure was but a type representing a whole circle of accompanying changes—all forming part of a social evolution, the end of which had not yet been reached. Rogers, too, in looking back upon this process of change, could have the satisfaction, such as it was, of having belonged to the party who had, during its successive stages, sympathized with it rather than opposed it. Born a Whig and a Dissenter, with boyish recollections of Dr. Price as an honoured guest at his father's house at Newington, and with recollections of the time when his own ambition was to be a Unitarian preacher, he had all his life held the tenets of moderate Whiggism. He knew Horne Tooke, became intimate with Fox and the Holland House set, contributed one article to the *Edinburgh*, and to his latest years acknowledged the blue and yellow as his political colours. But he was never an ardent politician—never so ardent a Whig as Jeffrey, or Moore, or Sydney Smith. He liked the society of men of all shades of politics; had Lord Holland at his house to meet the Duke of Wellington, and was much disconcerted when the Duke studiously avoided speaking to the Whig lord. Probably, too, before he died, he had seen Whiggism developed quite as far as he wished it; and if he had formulized his final belief in political matters, it would probably have been in some such general maxim as we once heard uttered by a man who had acted a conspicuous part in the Reform Bill movement, but over whose views there had since come a shade of the usual conservatism of advanced age: "After as much experience in politics," he said, "and as active a career on the side of change as any man in my time, the maxim that I would hand over to younger men as embodying my deepest belief, is, that it is a

terrible thing to give power into the hands of poverty and ignorance." Not that he had ceased to desire political equalization, or to believe that the world was tending to it, but that this maxim expressed his idea of the quickest rate at which, if possible, the cable of equalization should be permitted to go off the Parliamentary capstan. Probably Rogers would have agreed with him.

In the industrial order of facts, at all events, Rogers, in the course of his ninety-three years of life, saw an immensely changed world. The very earth of Great Britain did not bear the same herbs, the same grasses, the same fruits in the last years of his life as it had borne when, as a boy, he first became acquainted with its surface. Where he had once known patches of forest, he at last found level pasture; where he had once known furze and morasses, he at last found ploughed land and waving corn-fields. In some districts, not only the colours of the vegetation, but the very features of the scenery had been changed by the labours of the surveyor and the miner. During the first ten years of his life, the illiterate Brindley was astonishing England with his canals, and people were exulting in what seemed then the *ne plus ultra* in the art of land-carriage and locomotion. With mail-coaches England was already tolerably familiar; but Rogers was twenty-two years of age, and had his first volume of poems ready for the press, before any mail-coach ran on the road between London and Edinburgh. The steam-engine and all its applications came into being while Rogers was alive. It was in the very year of his birth that the Glasgow mechanic Watt set about making his first improved model of Newcomen's clumsy contrivance; he had reached manhood before Watt and Boulton sent forth their perfected engines from their works at Soho; he was fifty years of age before steam-boats began to paddle in the rivers or along the coasts of Britain or America; the miracle of sending a steamer across the Atlantic, in spite of Dr. Lardner, was performed after Rogers was seventy-five; and it was during the last five-and-twenty years of his life that Britain was netted with railways. The first balloon rose in the air when Rogers was a youth of twenty; he had passed the prime of his life before gas began to supersede oil-lamps and linkboys in the streets of our cities; and he was almost a nonagenarian, when the electric telegraph began to flash its messages from spot to spot, making the thoughts and sensations of every part of our island simultaneous, and promising to reduce the globe itself, for all purposes of intercommunication, within the compass of a walk of sixty minutes. And, then, when we think of the expansion in his time of our various manufactures! He was in his fifth year when Hargreaves had his house torn down

about him by the Lancashire spinners for inventing his spinning-jenny; he was but two years older when Arkwright left his barber's shop in Preston to set up his roller-machinery in a mill of his own; he was known as a poet before Crompton was heard of; and Heathcot's invention did not come into use till he was an elderly man. Add to these inventions for textile fabrication, the endless later modifications of them to adapt them to steam-power, and the myriads of machines devised to bring all the other processes of universal manufacture in whatever material within the reach of the same docile agency; and there is less difficulty in understanding how it was that, whereas, at the time of Rogers's birth, the entire population of the three British islands did not exceed ten or eleven millions—before he died, it was approaching thirty millions, and feeding colonies with the surplus. Not to speak of Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Glasgow, and other large towns—all of them creations of the industrial movement which had been going on since his birth—London alone had more than tripled itself within the same period. When he was born, the population of London was about 700,000; before he died, the houses had crept over the green fields all round so as to afford accommodation for between two and three millions.

With all this progressive medley of facts, too, Rogers had been connected almost solely by the one accidental circumstance that he had lived through it. Brindley would have constructed his canals; Arkwright would have developed the cotton-manufactures; Watt would have invented his steam-engine; gas would have come in, and railways would have been made, all the same had there been no Rogers. Even the reminiscences of the bard of Memory do not associate him much with this portion of the history of his times. He remembered that cocked-hats used to be worn in his boyhood, and that he had himself, when grown up, walked in St. Paul's churchyard wearing a cocked-hat; he remembered the time when umbrellas were rarities; he remembered being present at Lunardi's first balloon-ascent in England, when Fox had his pocket picked; and he doubtless remembered, as he went to evening parties in his youth, seeing the sedan-chairs emit their dowagers, and the boys extinguishing their smoking links in those queer conical iron tubes which still form part of the door-railings of the older houses in our street-squares. But, on the whole, his *Table-talk* does not seem to have abounded with reminiscences of this kind. Such mechanical and industrial improvements as came in his time, he seems to have taken for granted, not asking many questions about their origin, but enjoying them as a matter of course. The change, indeed, had been so gradual, that the old man of ninety, travelling in a first

class railway carriage, was probably quite as techy, in case the speed was under thirty miles an hour, as if that had been his accustomed rate of locomotion from his earliest infancy. Possibly, however, as a banker, Rogers may have had connexions with the industrial and commercial development of his time, which do not appear in memoirs of him as a poet.

The march of science in Rogers's time was as wonderful as the march of industrial enterprise; but Rogers's connexion with it was quite as slight. In mathematics, the differential and integral calculus, and the full development of the doctrine of probabilities, may be considered—though he was innocent enough, we believe, of all concern with them—as among the achievements of his time. In astronomy, the planets, Uranus and Neptune, with no end of planetoids, comets, &c., came into sensible being while he was alive to hear the news; and, what with Herschel's, what with Lord Rosse's telescopes, the azure sphere of star-filled space brought within the ken of our earth before Rogers died, was a million times more vast, and a million times better searched, than that which our keenest observatories could sweep when Rogers was born. What had been done in his time in General Physics, will be suggested if we remember such names as those of D'Alembert, Lagrange, Laplace, Hutton, Leslie, Biot, Wollaston, Fresnel, Young, Fourier, Arago, Humboldt, Galvani, and Volta, all of them his earlier or later contemporaries. The science of electricity, in anything like its present extent of application and ramification, is a later thing on the earth than Rogers's Poetry; and modern chemistry was absolutely created while he was passing through boyhood and manhood to his extreme old age. Black, Cavendish, and Priestley, were tearing the solids and fluids of our earth into their elementary fumes when Rogers was learning his letters; Lavoisier, all his analyses and delicate weighings over, perished by the guillotine when Rogers was receiving praises for his *Pleasures of Memory*; Davy was his junior by fifteen years, and closed his career while Rogers had twenty-six years longer to live; Dalton and his Atomic Theory were wholly contained within Rogers's existence; and he lived into the midst of the discoveries of Daguerre, and Liebig, and Dumas, and Faraday. Passing into the sciences of organic matter, we may next note, as a sufficient indication of what had been accomplished in them, such facts as that Linnæus did not die till Rogers was in his sixteenth year; that Jussieu's system and Goethe's botanical speculations came later; that Buffon and Hunter ended, and Blumenbach, and Cuvier, and St. Hilaire, and Oken, both began and ended their zoological and physiological researches while he was alive; and that Owen and others, still living, had made their fame before

his decease. During his lifetime, too, the mixed science of Geology, with all its wonders, took its place in the system of our knowledge; Gall and Spurzheim taught us to look at heads, and to connect character with brain and nerve; and, continuing the experiments of Mesmer, another set of inquirers knocked a hole through the wall of the sensible and substantial world in which we had hitherto been dwelling, and revealed the phenomena, or the supposed phenomena of animal magnetism, somnambulism, and clairvoyance.

What little relation, whether in the way of observation, or of thought, Rogers had to the current of scientific discovery and investigation which thus rushed past him, and bore him on during his ninety-three years of life, will be best illustrated by one or two extracts from his *Table-talk*—almost the only scraps of this kind of allusion which the volume contains:—

*Recollection of Priestley.*—"I was intimately acquainted with Dr. Priestley; and a more amiable man never lived; he was all gentleness, kindness, and humility. He was once dining with me, when some one asked him (rather rudely) 'how many books he had published?' He replied, 'Many more, sir, than I should like to read.' Before going to America, he paid me a visit, passing a night at my house. He left England chiefly in compliance with the wishes of his wife."

*A physiological(?) notion of John Hunter's.*—"John Hunter believed that when there was only one daughter and several sons in a family, the daughter was always of a masculine disposition; and that when a family consisted of several daughters and only one son, the son was always effeminate. Payne Knight used to say that Homer seems to have entertained the same idea; for in the *Iliad* we find that Dolon, who proves to be such a coward, was an only son, and had several sisters."

*Clairvoyance.*—"When I was at Paris, I went to Alexis and desired him to describe to me my house in St. James's Place. On my word, he astonished me! He described most exactly the peculiarities of the stair-case,—said that not far from the window in the drawing-room there was a picture of a man in armour, (the painting by Giorgione) &c., &c. Colonel Gurwood, shortly before his death, assured me that he was reminded by Alexis of some circumstances which had happened to him in Spain, and which he could not conceive how any human being, except himself, should know. Still, I cannot believe in clairvoyance,—because the thing is impossible."

Evidently, the science of his time had little interest for Rogers, when, from a volume of his *Table-talk*, all that can be selected bearing the slightest reference to scientific topics consists of one or two bits of gossip such as the above.

In the fine arts Rogers was more in his element; for all his life long he felt something more than the interest of an ordinary

dilettante in music, painting, sculpture, and architecture. In each of these arts, too, his time had produced much that was remarkable. In music, the world had, at the date of Rogers's birth, but recently lost Handel; but Piccini, Cimarosa, Gluck, Haydn, and Mozart, were at the height of their fame during his youth and manhood; and they were succeeded by Beethoven, Weber, Bellini, Rossini, Mendelssohn, Chopin, and Meyerbeer. Among British painters, after Hogarth, who died in 1764, Rogers could remember, as contemporaries, together or in succession, who had all died before him, such men as Sir Joshua Reynolds, Romney, West, Barry, Opie, Morland, Wilson, Gainsborough, Northcote, Stothard, Lawrence, Wilkie, Etty, Collins, and Turner; while, as painters of a still later generation, he left behind him many celebrated men, including the bold young pre-Raphaelites. Sculptors in his day of British birth were Flaxman, who was born eight years before him, and who died when he had already passed his sixty-second year, and Chantrey, who, coming later, pre-deceased him by fourteen years; while, in the same art, the Continent had boasted in the same age of a Canova, a Thorwaldsen, and a Dannecke. In architecture, Rogers had lived to hear of name after name, each name mentioned in connexion with some monument or building, the construction of which he could see going on, and also to hear most of these names sentenced to oblivion, and Greek architecture run down and Gothic architecture exalted, in the criticisms of Ruskin. Now, in all these arts, Rogers was himself a competent and cultured critic. To his latest day, he attended concerts and oratorios, and found, like the Duke of Wellington, when he was nearly as old, a real pleasure in listening evening after evening to the Grisis and Linds and Albonis, whose divine voices thrilled in the same halls where he had in earlier days listened to voices equally divine, and long since dumb in death; and to his latest day, in walking along the streets of the metropolis, he would look at new buildings with the eye of a connoisseur. But it was in painting and sculpture, as all know; that he most signalized his love of art. From his youth upwards he attended picture-sales and visited art-exhibitions; and his own collection of paintings and specimens of sculpture was as choice and various as any small private collection in Britain. Accordingly, his table-talk was, peculiarly rich not only in reminiscences relating to the history of these two arts in his time, but also in remarks conveying judgments of his own respecting eminent painters and sculptors and their styles. Here are a few specimens:—

*Reminiscences of Sir Joshua Reynolds.*—"I was present when Sir Joshua Reynolds delivered his last lecture at the Royal Academy. On entering the room I found that a semicircle of chairs immediately

in front of the pulpit was reserved for persons of distinction, being labelled, 'Mr. Burke,' 'Mr. Boswell,' &c., &c.; and I, with other young men, was forced to station myself a good way off. During the lecture a great crash was heard; and the company, fearing that the building was about to come down, rushed towards the door. Presently, however, it appeared that there was no cause for alarm," [the editor says in a footnote that there *was* cause for alarm, a beam having given way;] "and they endeavoured to resume their places; but, in consequence of the confusion, the reserved seats were now occupied by those who could first get them; and I, pressing forward, secured one of them. Sir Joshua concluded the lecture by saying, with great emotion—'And I should desire that the last words which I should pronounce in this Academy and from this place might be the name of—Michael Angelo.' As he descended from the rostrum, Burke went up to him, took his hand, and said,—

'The angel ended, and in Adam's ear  
So charming left his voice, that he a while  
'Thought him still speaking, still stood fixed to hear.'

—What a quantity of snuff Sir Joshua took! I once saw him at an academy-dinner, when his waistcoat was absolutely powdered with it. . . . I can hardly believe what was told me long ago by a gentleman living in the Temple, who, however, assured me that it was a fact. He happened to be passing by Sir Joshua's house in Leicester Square, when he saw a poor girl seated on the steps and crying bitterly. He asked what was the matter; and she replied that she was crying 'because the *one shilling* which she had received from Sir Joshua for sitting to him as a model, had proved to be a bad one, and he would not give her another.'

*English Art-Collections.*—"We have in England the finest series of pictures and the finest of sculptures in the world,—I mean the cartoons of Raphael and the Elgin marbles. Our national gallery is superior to any private collection of pictures in Italy,—superior, for instance, to the Doria and Borghese collections, which contain several very indifferent things. Perhaps the choicest private collection in this country is that at Panshanger, (Earl Cowper's;) it is small, but admirable; what Raphaels, what Andrea del Sartos, what Claudes!"

*Sir Thomas Lawrence.*—"Sir Thomas Lawrence used to say, that among painters there were three pre-eminent for *invention*—Giorgone, Rembrandt, and Rubens; and perhaps he was right.—Sir Thomas Lawrence has painted several very pleasing pictures of children; but, generally, his men are effeminate, and his women meretricious. Of his early portraits Sir Joshua Reynolds said—"This young man has a great deal of talent; but there is an affectation in his style which he will never entirely shake off."

*Recent English Painters.*—"We have now in England a greater number of tolerably good painters than ever existed here together at any former period: but, alas, we have no Hogarth and no Reynolds! I must not, however, forget that we have Turner,—a man of first-rate genius in his line. There is in some of his pictures a grandeur which

neither Claude nor Poussin could give to theirs. Turner thinks that Rubens's landscapes are deficient in *nature*. I differ from him. Indeed, *there*" [i.e., on the wall of Mr. Rogers's dining-room] "is a proof that he is mistaken. Look at that forest-scene by Rubens; the foreground of it is truth itself. The Art-Union is a perfect curse: it buys and engraves very inferior pictures, and consequently encourages mediocrity of talent; it makes young men, who have no genius, abandon the desk and counter, and set up for painters."

*Flaxman and Canova*.—"As to Flaxman, the greatest sculptor of his day,—the neglect which *he* experienced is something inconceivable. Canova, who was well acquainted with his exquisite illustrations of Dante, &c., could hardly believe that a man of such genius was not an object of admiration among his countrymen; and, in allusion to their insensibility to Flaxman's merits, and to their patronage of inferior artists, he said to some of the English at Rome, '*you see with your ears!*'"

*Chantrey*.—"Chantrey began his career by being a carver in wood. The ornaments on that mahogany sideboard and on that stand, (in Mr. Rogers's dining-room,) were carved by him. \* \* When he was at Rome in the height of his celebrity, he injured himself not a little by talking with contempt of the finest statues of antiquity. Jackson (the painter) told me that he and Chantrey went into the studio of Dannecke the sculptor, who happened to be from home. There was an unfinished bust in the room; and Chantrey, taking up a chisel, proceeded to work upon it. One of the assistants immediately rushed forwards, in great alarm, to stop him; but no sooner had Chantrey given a blow on the chisel than the man exclaimed, with a knowing look, '*Ha! ha!*'—as much as to say, '*I see you perfectly understand what you are about.*' Chantrey practised portrait-painting both at Sheffield and after he came to London. It was in allusion to him that Lawrence said, '*A broken-down painter will make a very good sculptor.*'"

After all, whether as reminiscence or as opinion, this is light enough; and, unless Mr. Dyce has failed to give a fair representation of Rogers's talk, even on what were his favourite subjects, we can easily see that, neither in facts relating to the history of art in his day, nor in doctrines and conclusions appertaining to the theory of art, was the conversation of Rogers by any means so rich as might have been expected from his reputation as an art-patron. Throughout the whole volume there is not a gleam of any real principle in art which Rogers was in the habit of propounding; not a symptom of any such habit of research and generalization as pervades every page about art written, for example, by Ruskin. And yet, evidently, Rogers's taste for paintings and statues was perfectly genuine. He liked to be surrounded by them; he had a quiet enjoyment of their beauties, which he could at least feel and avow, if he could not explain it;

and he had preferences and dislikes, in matters of art, which, simply as the preferences and dislikes of a man of fine perceptions, were entitled to respect. Probably his own lines in his *Epistle to a Friend*, inviting him to pay him a visit, express justly enough (though the kind of mansion pictured in them hardly comes up to the reality of St. James's Place) the nature and extent of Rogers's pleasure in walks of art:—

"Here no state-chambers in long line unfold,  
Bright with broad mirrors, rough with fretted gold;  
Yet modest ornament, with use combined,  
Attracts the eye to exercise the mind.  
Small change of scene, small space his home requires,  
Who leads a life of satisfied desires.  
What though no marble breathes, no canvas glows,  
From every point a ray of genius flows!  
Be mine to bless the more mechanic skill  
That stamps, renews, and multiplies the will;  
And cheaply circulates, thro' distant climes,  
The fairest relics of the purest times.  
Here from the mould to conscious being start  
Those finer forms, the miracles of art;  
Here chosen gems, imprest on sulphur, shine,  
That slept for ages in a second mine;  
And here the faithful graver dares to trace  
A Michael's grandeur, and a Raphael's grace!  
Thy gallery, Florence, gilds my humble walls;  
And my low roof the Vatican recalls!"

There remains yet to be passed in review, in connexion with the life of Rogers, that portion or department of the miscellaneous incident and activity of his age, with which his relations were more intimate and peculiar than even with its Art—to wit, its Literature. Here, also, much came into being, attained its bloom, and again shed its seed for future growths, during the ninety-three years of Rogers's pilgrimage on earth. Let us feature more exactly what came and went during those ninety-three years in this department also.

And, first, as regards the philosophy of this period, the literature of its highest speculative thought. Here, if we may so speak, there had been a complete circuit of the clock, or even a circuit and a half, in Rogers's lifetime. The latest names of eminence in British metaphysics at the date of his birth in 1763, were those of Bishop Berkeley, Bishop Butler, and David Hartley, all of whom had died within the ten preceding years. Then, as the chief representatives of British philosophy during the first thirty years of Rogers's life, there were the Scottish thinkers, Hume, and Reid, and Adam Smith, with their less solid com-

patriots, Kames and Monboddo; balanced somewhat inadequately in South Britain by such men as Priestley and Paley. Rogers was a boy of thirteen when David Hume died; but all the others here named lived till Rogers had reached manhood, and he was personally acquainted with Adam Smith and Monboddo, as well as with Priestley. After these men, too, had passed away in their generation, the metaphysical succession was kept up by Dugald Stewart, and Jeremy Bentham, and Mackintosh, and Coleridge, and Thomas Brown, and James Mill, all of whom were his coevals within a few years, and all of whom, after he had been on intimate terms with some of them, he survived twenty years or more. Thus Coleridge and Bentham both died in 1834. Lastly, ere he died, the old poet was breathing an atmosphere charged with the philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, and Carlyle, and the younger Mill, and many others with whose names, at least, as powers in the intellectual world, who had made their appearance when his own career was all but finished, he must have been familiar. So much as regards the mere external history of the period of British philosophy which he had lived through. If we take into account the internal history represented in such a series of facts and names, the impression of what he did thus live through, will be much increased. In living through the period marked by such men and names, he had, whether he knew it or not, lived through one of those periods in the history of universal thought, in which the old and ever-recurring battle between the two antagonistic philosophies which have divided men since the beginning of the world, had been fought over afresh—nay, probably fought over twice—with a vigour unparalleled since the Middle Ages, and in forms of language quite new. The one extreme of his life, for example, rests in that epoch when, out of the Anglo-Irish Idealism of Berkeley, counteracted, as it was, by the English sensationalism and incipient materialism of Hartley, there has already been bred the through-going Scottish scepticism of Hume; and when, in order to restore faith, Hume's countryman, Reid, has already rushed, or, rather patiently trudged into the vacuum, to feel for the solid rock, and lay down, block by block, his philosophy of common sense. From that day forward, the true opposition in Britain is between the Scottish philosophy of Reid, and the native English sensationalism bequeathed by Locke and Hartley, and working itself out slowly to its final consequences. The two streams flow together, and sometimes cross and intermix. Meanwhile, however, the same great battle has been fighting itself, in other forms, on the Continent. In Germany, Kant, roused as Reid had been in Scotland, to a defence of the faith in philosophy against the scepticism of Hume, had defended it in

his profounder German fashion, and had thus given rise to the German Transcendental Philosophy, with all that has since come out of it. This philosophical activity of Kant falls fully within the life of Rogers, for Kant died in 1804, when Rogers was a man of forty. In France, on the other hand—the intellectual scepticism of Hume mingling at once with what may be called the native moral and social scepticism of Voltaire—there had issued, as the natural but still illogical result, that Gallic system of sensationalism, which, far more avowedly materialistic than the contemporary sensationalism of England, reigned supreme till, in comparatively recent times, Scotland and Germany supplied modifying elements. Now, both of these foreign philosophies reacted on that British controversy with which they had original relations. Through the poetic-philosophic mind of Coleridge, as through a window of coloured glass, there was poured into the prevalent sensationalism, or into the ill-mixed sensationalism and traditional theology of England, a flood of tinted German light; while the task of revising Reid's philosophy from the foundation, with the aid of a thorough knowledge of all that Kant and his German successors had done, and so deepening and rebuilding the national Scottish Philosophy, fell to the harder and severer mind of Sir William Hamilton. The communication between English and French sensationalism had all this while been going on through such thinkers as Bentham and Mill; and more recently we have had an infusion of French sensationalism in its most pronounced materialistic form of so-called Positivism, through translations from M. Auguste Comte.

Had any one informed old Rogers that he had lived through all this, he would probably have said that he was really not aware of it, but was very glad to hear it, and hoped it was all over. He was certainly one of those who put in practice Goethe's famous anti-metaphysical maxim; and did not trouble themselves with thinking about thinking. Herein he differed greatly not only from his friend Coleridge, but also from his friend Wordsworth, and many other contemporary poets. His philosophy, so far as he had any, was the simple practical philosophy which confines itself to the consideration of the art of pleasant and tranquil living; and, wherever he deals with maxim, it is with the time-honoured maxims which have been rubbed smooth by poets in the service of this philosophy. Hume or Reid, Kant or Comte, it was all the same to him; for, whichever philosophy was uppermost, there seemed little danger that *his* little metaphysics—which consisted very much in believing that men ought to pay their way, keep their temper, and cultivate soft affections—would ever be disturbed or persecuted. Almost the

only one of his poems in which one discerns something of the influence of contemporary metaphysical speculation, is his *Pleasures of Memory*, which is a mild poetical exposition of the doctrine of the association of ideas as made popular by Hartley and others. Nor, unfortunately as regards the interest of his *Table-talk* in the department of gossip about contemporary philosophers and philosophic systems, was Rogers one of those who make up for not thinking about thinking by (what is really a very different thing) thinking about thinking about thinking. Goethe, who desired to avoid the first, was his whole life practising the second; and hence his own metaphysics consisted in being anti-metaphysical. Moreover, for the same reason, his talk was rich enough in references to the history of thought and speculation in his time. But in Rogers's case it was otherwise; and had it not been that eminent men were interesting to him as such, without any regard to the precise grounds of their eminence, and that, seeing, in the course of his long life, celebrated thinkers as well as celebrated poets, or actors, or men of fashion, he noticed them with curiosity, and afterwards told his reminiscences of them, the history of British speculation in his time, important as that history was, would have had nothing to represent it in his *Table-Talk*. As it is, however, simply because Rogers lived so long and knew so many people, he could not but have some interesting enough recollections of the ways and physiognomies of men of the philosophic tribe; here are a few such:—

*Story of Hume and his Critics.*—"Hume told Cadell the bookseller, that he had a great desire to be introduced to as many of the persons who had written against him as could be collected; and requested Cadell to bring him and them together. Accordingly, Dr. Douglas, Dr. Adams, &c. &c., were invited by Cadell to dine at his house in order to meet Hume. They came; and Dr. Price, who was of the party, assured me that they were all delighted with David."

*Recollection of Adam Smith.*—"When a young man, I went to Edinburgh, carrying letters of introduction (from Dr. Kippis, Dr. Price, &c.) to Adam Smith, Robertson, and others. When I first saw Smith he was at breakfast, eating strawberries; and he descanted on the superior flavour of those grown in Scotland. I found him very kind and communicative. He was (what Robertson was not) a man who had seen a great deal of the world. Once, in the course of conversation, I happened to remark of some writer, that he was rather superficial,—a Voltaire.' 'Sir,' cried Smith, striking the table with his hand, 'there has been but one Voltaire.'"

*Anecdote of Paley.*—"I never saw Paley; but my brother knew him well and liked him much. Paley used to say, in his broad dialect, 'I am an advocate for corroption,' (that is, parliamentary influence.)"

*Coleridge's Talk.*—"Coleridge was a marvellous talker. One morning, when Hookham Frere also breakfasted with me, Coleridge talked for three hours without intermission about poetry, and so admirably, that I wish every word he uttered had been taken down. But sometimes his harangues were quite unintelligible, not only to myself, but to others. Wordsworth and I called upon him one forenoon, when he was in a lodging off Pall Mall. He talked uninterruptedly for about two hours, during which Wordsworth listened to him with profound attention, every now and then nodding his head as if in assent. On quitting the lodging, I said to Wordsworth, 'Well, for my own part, I could not make head or tail of Coleridge's oration; pray, did you understand it?' 'Not one syllable of it,' was Wordsworth's reply."

*Mackintosh.*—"When I lived in the Temple, Mackintosh and Richard Sharp used to come to my chambers, and stay there for hours, talking metaphysics. One day they were so intent on their 'first cause,' 'spirit,' and 'matter,' that they were unconscious of my having left them, paid a visit, and returned. I was a little angry at this, and, to show my indifference about them, I sat down and wrote letters, without taking any notice of them. I never met a man with a fuller mind than Mackintosh,—such readiness on all subjects, such a talker!"

*Rogers puzzled as to the origin of evil.*—"Why there should be evil in the world is indeed a mystery. Milton attempts to answer the question; but he has not done it satisfactorily. The three acutest men with whom I was ever acquainted, Sir James Mackintosh, Malthus, and Bobus Smith [an elder brother of Sydney] were all agreed that the attributes of the Deity must be in some respects limited, else there could be no sin and misery."

This last quotation will indicate, better than anything else could, Rogers's *calibre* as a metaphysician on his own account. Only fancy a little old gentleman citing it as the deliberate opinion of the three acutest men he had ever known, and intimating his disposition to agree with them, that, in order to account for the existence of evil, it is necessary to suppose that the Deity is in some respects incompetent, and does not fill all creation, but only, as it were, a large piece of the middle of it! That such a wretched little bit of Anthropomorphism could have lingered in the theology of any creature in the nineteenth century, and much more that it should unsuspectingly be given out by him in conversation as passable metaphysics, might seem incredible. That Rogers had misconceived something which he had heard Mackintosh, Malthus, and Bobus Smith say, we take for granted; and, indeed, but for a note of Mr. Dyce's, which shows that he was himself surprised at the opinion he heard Rogers quote, we should fancy that the mistake was his. As it is, the saying is an authentic measure of the intellect, and, we might say also, of the imagination of Rogers.

Besides philosophers, Rogers had seen, during his ninety-three years of life, a considerable number of Historians come and go, adding by their conjoint labours to the historical department of British literature much of what, in that department, now constitutes our chief boast and excellence. "Hume and Smollett," for example, now a kind of permanent literary entity in the British mind, was an association of names which had hardly been formed when Rogers was a child; for Smollett's historical work had appeared in 1758, and Hume's last volumes were published in 1762. Robertson had taken his place among our historical writers a year or two before Rogers's birth; but his "Charles V." was not published till 1769, and his "History of America" not till 1777, when Rogers was old enough to read it. The standard History of English Poetry, by Thomas Warton, was in course of publication between 1774 and 1781, or between Rogers's twelfth and his nineteenth year. Rogers was fourteen years old in 1776, when the first quarto volume of Gibbon's great work was submitted to the public; he was already an author himself on that memorable evening in 1787, when Gibbon, having written the last page of his last volume, walked up and down in the moonlight beneath the acacias at Lausanne, proud for a moment and then again sad that the labour of his life was at end. Contemporary with these men, or surviving them, so as to begin the present century, were the Lyttletons, the Dalrymples, the Fergusons, the Pinkertons, and other minor historical writers. We had no complete History of Greece till Rogers was verging on his fiftieth year, when Mitford's work was finished; Thirlwall came later to correct and obliterate Mitford; and before Rogers died, we were waiting for the twelfth volume of Grote. What a mass of matter, in other respects, Rogers saw, with his own eyes, added to the historical section of our literature after he had reached the age of ripe manhood—a mass that would form, we believe, fully one half of the entire section, as it is exhibited continuously in the historical shelves of our great libraries—may be suggested if we remember that to this time belongs the influence on the historical literature of Europe of the genius of Sir Walter Scott, and that Mackintosh, Hallam, James Mill, M'Cric, Southey, Arnold, Alison, Macaulay, and Carlyle, have all lived and written during the same prolific age.

Under this head, one or two extracts relating to the earlier historians, will shew the nature of Rogers's reminiscences.

*The historian Robertson.*—"Robertson was very kind to me. He, one morning, spread out the map of Scotland on the floor, and got upon his knees, to describe the route I ought to follow in making a tour on horseback through the Highlands."

*Gibbon.*—"It is well known that Fox visited Gibbon at Lausanne; and he was much gratified by the visit. Gibbon, he said, talked a great deal, walking up and down the room, and generally ending his sentences with a genitive case; every now and then, too, casting a look of complacency on his own portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds, which hung over the chimney-piece—that wonderful portrait, in which, while the oddness and vulgarity of the features are refined away, the likeness is perfectly preserved. . . . Gibbon took very little exercise. He had been staying some time with Lord Sheffield in the country; and when he was about to go away, the servants could not find his hat. 'Bless me,' said Gibbon, 'I certainly left it in the hall on my arrival here.' He had not stirred out of doors during the whole of the visit."

*Thomas Warton.*—"I never saw Thomas Warton. I once called at the house of Robinson, the bookseller, for Dr. Kippis, who used to introduce me to many literary parties, and who that evening was to take me to the Society of Antiquaries. He said, 'Tom Warton is up stairs.' How I now wish that I had gone up and seen him! Nor did I ever see Gibbon."

*Mitford.*—"Mitford, the historian of Greece, possessed, besides his learning, a wonderful variety of accomplishments. I always felt the highest respect for him. When, not long before his death, I used to meet him in the street, bent almost double, and carrying a long staff in his hand, he reminded me of a venerable pilgrim just come from Jerusalem. His account of the Homeric age,—of the Sicilian cities,—and several other parts of his history, are very pleasing."

We have reserved to the last that department of the literary activity, and indeed of the universal activity of Britain, during the last ninety-three years, with which Rogers's personal relations were most intimate and peculiar—the department of poetical or imaginative literature, in its widest sense, and as including all corresponding literary criticism. A somewhat closer survey of what was produced in this department in both its subdivisions—that of Prose and that of Verse—will form, therefore, the appropriate conclusion of the present paper. In such other matters as we have hitherto been speaking of, Rogers was little more than a passive observer, borne along in a movement impelled by others; but here, to some extent, he performed an active part.

Prose Imaginative Literature divides itself, to all ordinary intents and purposes, into the two heads of the Novel and the Drama. In both of these kinds of literature, Rogers saw an immense and progressive change. At the time when he was born, the modern British novel had only just been invented, while the Drama was in all its glory. Fielding had been dead but nine years; Richardson but two; Sterne and Smollett were still alive; Goldsmith, Johnson, and Walpole, were hardly past

the middle of their career; Foote was entertaining all London with his witticisms, and drawing crowded houses by his farces; and Garrick was still the wonder of the stage. Goldsmith died when Rogers was a boy of ten; Foote when Rogers was in his fifteenth year; Garrick, two years later; Johnson survived till Rogers was twenty-one; and Walpole did not die till Rogers was thirty-four. Such were the men and the influences ruling in popular British literature, and especially in the literature of prose-fiction and criticism, when Rogers began his life. Before he had ended it, what a host of new names he could count! After Garrick, the Kembles, the Siddonses, the Keans, the Macreadys, and many others, whose faces and gestures are commemorated in our histories of the stage, and live in the recollections of those who saw them, had entered and crossed the boards and picked up their bouquets and bowed and made their exit; and, to supply these, or their more grotesque and mirth-provoking associates, with such new matter as the demands of their audiences required, there had been a contemporary series of dramatic authors. On the whole, however, the age of high dramatic production for the actual purposes of the stage had passed away. In Tragedy it was notoriously so, for, with few exceptions, it was as actors in the old dramas of Shakespeare and his successors, that the tragedians we have named spent their lives; but even in Comedy, the same fact was apparent. Out of hundreds of comic writers for the stage, who had come in the place of the Goldsmiths and Footes and Garricks, only a very few—such as Colman the elder (1733-1794), Cumberland (1732-1811), Holcroft (1745-1809), O’Keefe (1746-1833), Sheridan (1751-1816), Mrs. Inchbald (1753-1821), Colman the younger (1762-1836,) and Reynolds (1765-1841,)—could be noted as worthy of a place in the annals of true literature during the period of Rogers’s earlier and later manhood; while, if we come down later still, to the cluster of purveyors of theatrical literature, who were busy in Rogers’s old age, and whom he left behind him catering for the generation to which we ourselves belong, almost the only prose-dramatist, employing real intellect and real literary skill in that species of production, was Douglas Jerrold. During Rogers’s life, therefore, the drama, as a form of our true and permanent literature, had become almost extinct. To what precise combination of social causes this decline of a form of literature once so popular, was owing, we need not here inquire. Late dinners may have had something to do with it; but, in a great measure, the phenomenon is to be accounted for by the rise of new forms of evening amusement, competing with the “legitimate” drama, and obliging the proprietors of theatres to substitute mere fun and farce and *spectacle*, for the more in-

tellectual entertainment which had once sufficed. Moreover, and possibly also involving some relation of cause and effect, the fact is undoubted, that this era of the decline of the legitimate British drama was the era of the development of the legitimate British novel. Observe how, in this department, writer after writer sprang up in Rogers's lifetime, each betaking himself, as by instinct, to that form of narrative fiction which Richardson, and Fielding, and Smollett, and Sterne, and Goldsmith had already made classical, and all, by their successive modifications of it, helping to bring us forward to our present age of universal novel-writing and novel-reading, with its vast apparatus of circulating libraries. Immediate successors of those fathers of the British novel, whom we have named as still alive or only just dead at the time of Rogers's birth, were such writers as Henry Mackenzie, whose "*Man of Feeling*" was published in 1771; Miss Burney, whose "*Evelina*" was published in 1777; and Hannah More, whose moral tales were in request when Rogers was yet a youth. Mrs. Inchbald's "*Simple Story*" appeared in 1791, and her "*Nature and Art*" in 1796. Then came the powerful genius of Godwin, whose "*Caleb Williams*" was published in 1794; and then the various activity of the oriental Beckford, the mystery-loving Mrs. Radcliffe with her corridors and old Italian castles, the shrewd and moral Miss Edgeworth, the shrewd and lady's-secrets-revealing Miss Austen, and the ghastly M. G. Lewis. By these and other novelists the demand was supplied till about the year 1814, when "*Waverley*" appeared, proclaiming the advent, in this field of literature, of the greatest master of historical romance, and the romance of antique life, that the world has ever seen. The genius of Scott took possession of the land, and, under his influence there came that outburst of the literature of chivalry which has lasted, in various forms, to our own day. Somewhat later, and with more or less of Scott's influence traceable in them, have come the sentimental novel, the fashionable novel, the naval novel, and the political novel, practised by the Bulwers, the Gores, the Marryatts, the Disraelis, and myriads more; while, in still more recent times, there has been a new literary avatar in the serial novels of Dickens, Thackeray, Lever, and their imitators, and even, competing with that, there has appeared what may be called the literature of philosophical and speculative fiction.

In poetry proper, or the art of verse, the amount and the variety of what the age of Rogers brought forth and added on, as its contribution, to the literature it had inherited from the past, were not less remarkable. Take a few of the external facts. When Rogers was born, Collins and Dyer and Allan Ramsay were just dead. Shenstone died in the very year of his birth;

Churchill the following year; Young not till the year after that; and Rogers was a child of six when Falconer sailed on his fatal voyage, and one year older when, in the heart of that metropolis with whose streets he was just beginning to be acquainted, Chatterton was found dead in his garret. In the same year (1770) Akenside died; in the following year, Gray; and three years later, Goldsmith. The poetry of these men, with Beattie's "Minstrel," completed in 1774, the classic verses of Mason and the Wartons, and such more ponderous stuff as Johnson chose to put forth under the name of poetry, formed the staple reading of those who read recent or contemporary verse at all during the first twenty years of Rogers's life. The commencement of a new era in British poetry, dates almost exactly from the time when he himself began to be a poet. Indeed, in our histories of British literature it is usual to fix on the year 1786—the very year in which Rogers published his first volume of poems—as the year which closed one period, and begun that other which extends to our own time. For a year or two before 1786, there had been manifestations of a new poetic spirit differing from that of the poetry of the eighteenth century as a whole, and more particularly from that of Darwin, Hayley, and the silly Della Cruscans, who represented the poetry of the eighteenth century in its latest and dying stage. Crabbe, for example, had published his "Library" in 1781; and Cowper had made his first distinct appearance as a poet in 1782, when he was already in his fifty-second year. Crabbe's "Village" was published in 1783; and Cowper first made an effective impression by the publication of his second volume, including his "Task," in 1785. Thus, Rogers was heard of as a poet almost at the same time as Crabbe and Cowper, the former of whom was born nine years before him, and the latter of whom was his senior by thirty-two years, and died fifty-six years ago. But more exactly contemporary with Rogers than either Crabbe or Cowper was a poet greater than both. In that very year 1786, which saw Rogers's *Ode to Superstition and other poems* issued from a London press, the first edition of the poems of Robert Burns was published at Kilmarnock. It is this fact, perhaps, together with the necessity of fixing on *some* year, that has disposed our literary historians to fix on 1786 as the true beginning of our present literary era. But, even with such men as Crabbe, Cowper, and Burns already in the field, the battle of the new against the old was not immediately concluded. Bowles, born the year before Rogers, published his famous "Fourteen Sonnets" in 1789; and such was the effect on the tastes of contemporary Englishmen of this little publication issued from an obscure printing office at Bath, that it is not unusual to speak of it, rather than

of any of the preceding publications of Crabbe, Cowper, or Burns, as having first taught our poets and critics at the close of last century what true poetry was. At all events, Wordsworth, in whom the poetic Revolution was completed, acknowledged himself to be a disciple of Bowles. "When Bowles's Sonnets first appeared," Wordsworth himself said to Mr. Dyce, "I bought them in a walk through London with my dear brother, who was afterwards drowned at sea. I read them as we went along; and, to the great annoyance of my brother, I stopped in a niche of London Bridge to finish the pamphlet." Coleridge and Southey have recorded, in very similar terms, their delight in first reading these Sonnets; and it was not till 1792 that these poets, reading Wordsworth's "Descriptive Sketches," published in that year, transferred their allegiance from Bowles to the greater and younger poet. In that year also, it will be remembered, Rogers made his second appearance as a poet in his *Pleasures of Memory*. The author of the *Pleasures of Memory* was seven years the senior of the new poet, who was then but twenty-two, and had his fame to win. How he did win it, and how already before the close of the last century, the names of Wordsworth, and of his friends Coleridge and Southey, (born, the one in 1772, the other in 1774,) were even better known in English poetry than that of Rogers, though he had had the start of them by several years, it can hardly be necessary to remind any one. The whole of the early productive activity of these three poets, as well as the collateral critical services of Gifford in lashing the Della Cruscans to death, falls within the interval between Rogers's thirtieth and his fortieth year. And then, onward from his fortieth year to near his fiftieth, or from 1802 to 1812, what is he but one star in that unusually large constellation of contemporary poets which included Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Crabbe, Bowles, and others already named, as well as such men of later appearance, as Scott, Campbell, Moore, Bloomfield, Hogg, James Montgomery, Kirke White, and Charles Lamb. With all or nearly all of these men Rogers was on terms of intimacy; he bought their successive productions as they appeared; and he read also the criticisms upon them which formed so much of the matter of the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*. Campbell's "Pleasures of Hope" was published in 1799, or seven years after the poem of Rogers which suggested the title; and Scott's narrative poems filled the ten years between 1805 and 1815. Then when, satiated with the rich variety of all these poets, the British public were beginning to think that they had poetry enough, there came the commotion of Byron's muse, fluttering these poets into new activity, and raising a flight of others for the first time from the ground. The Byronic period lasted,

we may say, from 1809 to 1824, and included within it not only the continuation of the literary lives of Wordsworth, Bowles, Southey, Crabbe, Rogers himself, Campbell, Moore, and Scott, but also the meteoric apparition and disappearance of Shelley and Keats. In a sky red with the glare of Byron's genius, the poetry of these two younger spirits hung for a time like a pale white vapour which men hardly marked; but scarcely had Byron died when, as the glare began to die away, the pale white vapour floated farther and more visibly, and Wordsworth and others still surviving to send forth later and not discordant emanations to mingle with it, the atmosphere assumed its more normal aspect of quiet blue well charged with cloud. All this Rogers saw, and as gazing on the becalmed heaven from which the Byronic storm had thus passed, and in which the influence of Wordsworth, modified by that of Shelley and Keats, was again prevailing, he began about his seventieth year to ask what would be next,—lo, on the horizon the Tennysonian star! Higher up the heavens it rolls, ever clearer and brighter as the gloom fills the vault; star after star follows in its train; the old stars meanwhile sinking in the horizon opposite; and ere the veteran himself quits the scene, the Tennysonian constellation, too, seems to have reached its mid-arc, and the stars of an unformed new one are glimmering in the east.

So much for the external facts of the history of British poetry during the life of Rogers. He lived, we may add, in six laureateships. Whitehead was Laureate when Rogers was born; and, as his term of office extended to 1788, Rogers began his poetic career as one of Whitehead's subjects. Then came Warton's short laureateship, from 1788 to 1790; then the reign of Henry James Pye, from 1790 to 1813; next that of Southey from 1813 to 1843; next that of Wordsworth, who died in 1850; and lastly that of Tennyson. Of all, therefore, that intervenes between the beginning of Whitehead's laureateship and the sixth year of Tennyson's, Rogers forms a part. A few of his reminiscences of the literary men of this period, will show at least his social relations to its successive peers and conjunctions of influence.

*Early Poetical Readings.*—"I was a mere lad when Mason's *Gray* was published. I read it in my young days with delight, and have done so ever since: the Letters have for me an inexpressible charm; they are as witty as Walpole's, and have what his want, true wisdom. I used to take a pocket edition of Gray's Poems with me during my morning walks to town to my father's banking-house, where I was a clerk, and read them by the way. I can repeat them all. . . . I remember taking Beattie's *Minstrel* down from my father's shelves, on a fine summer evening, and reading it, for the first time, with such delight! It still charms me,—(I mean the First Book; the Second is very inferior.)"

*Attempted call on Dr. Johnson.*—"My friend Maltby and I, when we were very young men, had a strong desire to see Dr. Johnson; and we determined to call upon him and introduce ourselves. We accordingly proceeded to his house in Bolt Court; and I had my hand on the knocker, when our courage failed us, and we retreated. Many years afterwards, I mentioned the circumstance to Boswell, who said, 'What a pity that you did not go boldly in! he would have received you with all kindness.'"

*Burns.*—"I never saw Burns: I was within thirty miles of Dumfries when he was living there, and yet I did not go to visit him, which I have regretted ever since. . . . I think his *Cottar's Saturday Night* the finest pastoral in any language. How incapable of estimating Burns's genius were the worthy folks of Edinburgh! Henry Mackenzie (who ought to have known better) advised him to take for his model in song-writing, Mrs. John Hunter."

*Reception of Rogers's early Poems.*—"On the publication of the *Pleasures of Memory*, I sent a copy to Mason, who never acknowledged it. I learned, however, from Gilpin, and to my great satisfaction, that Mason, in a letter to him, had spoken well of it; he pronounced it to be very different in style from the poetry of the day. . . . When I first came forward as a poet, I was highly gratified by the praise which Hayley bestowed on my writings, and which was communicated to me by Cadell, the publisher. In those days, indeed, praise was sweet to me, even when it came from those who were far inferior to Hayley: what pleasure I felt on being told that Este had said of me, 'A child of Goldsmith, sir!'"

*Crabbe.*—"I have heard Crabbe describe his mingled feelings of hope and fear as he stood on London Bridge, when he first came up to town to try his fortune in the literary world. . . . Crabbe's early poetry is by far the best as to finish. I asked him why he did not compose his later verses with equal care. He answered, 'Because my reputation is already made.' When he afterwards told me that he never produced more than *forty* verses a day, I said that he had better do as I do,—stint himself to *four*."

*Wordsworth and Fox.*—"I introduced Wordsworth to Fox, having taken him with me to a ball given by Mrs. Fox. 'I am very glad to see you, Mr. Wordsworth, though I am not of your faction,' was all that Fox said to him,—meaning that he admired a school of poetry different from that to which Wordsworth belonged."

*Southey, Coleridge, and Wordsworth.*—"In all his domestic relations, Southey was the most amiable of men; but he had no general philanthropy; he was what you call a *cold* man. He was never happy except when reading a book or making one. Coleridge once said to me, 'I can't *think* of Southey, without seeing him either mending or using a pen.' I spent some time with him at Lord Lonsdale's, in company with Wordsworth and others; and while the rest of the party were walking about, talking and amusing themselves, Southey preferred sitting *solus* in the library. 'How *cold* he is!' was the exclamation of Wordsworth,—himself so joyous and communicative.—Southey

told me that he had read Spenser through about *thirty* times, and that he could not read Pope through once. He thought meanly of Virgil; so did Coleridge; and so, at one time, did Wordsworth. When I lately mentioned to Wordsworth an unfavourable opinion which he had formerly expressed to me about a passage in Virgil, 'Oh,' he said, 'we used to talk a great deal of no sense in those days.'"

*Sir Walter Scott.*—"I introduced Sir Walter Scott to Madame D'Arblay, having taken him with me to her house. She had not heard that he was lame; and when he limped towards a chair, she said, 'Dear me, Sir Walter, I hope you have not met with an accident?' He answered, 'An accident, madam, nearly as old as my birth.' . . . There is a very pleasing spirit of kindness in Scott's *Life of Swift* and *Lives of the Novelists*; he endeavours to place everybody's actions in the most favourable light. . . . As a *story*, his *Lady of the Lake* is delightful. On the whole, his *poetry* is too carelessly written to suit my taste; but parts of it are very happy."

*Byron.*—"Neither Moore nor myself had ever seen Byron, when it was settled that he should dine at my house to meet Moore; nor was he known by sight to Campbell, who, happening to call upon me that morning, consented to join the party. I thought it best that I alone should be in the drawing-room when Byron entered it; and Moore and Campbell accordingly withdrew. Soon after his arrival they returned, and I introduced them to him severally, naming them as Adam named the beasts. When we sat down to dinner, I asked Byron if he would take soup? 'No; he never took soup.'—Would he take some fish? 'No; he never took fish.'—Presently, I asked if he would eat some mutton? 'No; he never ate mutton.'—I then asked if he would take a glass of wine? 'No; he never tasted wine.'—It was now necessary to inquire what he *did* eat and drink; and the answer was,—'Nothing but hard biscuits and soda-water.' Unfortunately, neither hard biscuits nor soda-water were at hand; and he dined upon potatoes bruised down on his plate and drenched with vinegar. My guests stayed till very late, discussing the merits of Walter Scott and Joanna Baillie. Some days after, meeting Hobhouse, I said to him,—'How long will Lord Byron persevere in his present diet?' He replied,—'Just as long as you continue to notice it.' I did not then know what I now know to be a fact,—that Byron, after leaving my house, had gone to a Club in St. James's Street and eaten a hearty meat-supper. . . . Byron had prodigious facility of composition. He was fond of suppers, and used often to sup at my house and eat heartily, (for he had then given up the hard biscuit and soda-water diet;) after going home he would throw off sixty or eighty verses, which he would send to press next morning. . . . In those days, at least, Byron had no readiness of reply in conversation. If you happened to let fall any observation which offended him, he would say nothing at the time, but the offence would lie rankling in his mind, and, perhaps, a fortnight after, he would suddenly come out with some very cutting remarks upon you, giving them as his deliberate opinions, the results of his experience of your character. . . . My latest inter-

course with Byron was in Italy. We travelled some time together; and, if there was any scenery particularly well worth seeing, he generally contrived that we should pass through it in the dark. . . . At this time we generally had a regular quarrel every night, and he would abuse me through thick and thin, raking up all the stories he had heard which he thought most likely to mortify me—how I had behaved with great cruelty to Murphy, refusing to assist him in his distress, &c., &c. But next morning he would shake me kindly by both hands, and we were excellent friends again. When I parted from him in Italy, (never to meet him more,) a good many persons were looking on, anxious to catch a glimpse of ‘the famous lord.’ ”

*Shelley.*—“One day, during dinner, at Pisa, when Shelley and Trelawney were with us, Byron chose to run down Shakespeare, (for whom he, like Sheridan, either had, or pretended to have, little admiration.) I said nothing. But Shelley immediately took up the defence of the great poet, and conducted it in his usual meek yet resolute manner, unmoved by the rude things with which Byron interrupted him—‘Oh, that’s very well for an atheist,’ &c. . . . Before meeting Shelley in Italy, I had seen him only once. It was at my own house in St. James’s Place, where he called upon me—introducing himself—to request the loan of some money which he wished to present to Leigh Hunt; and he offered me a bond for it. Having numerous claims upon me at that time I was obliged to refuse the loan. Both in appearance and in manners, Shelley was the perfect gentleman.”

In the language of these reminiscences, though they refer mainly to Rogers’s *social* relations to his more distinguished poetic contemporaries, earlier and later, as far as Shelley, (and of such allusions as his table-talk contained to poets and poetical matters subsequent to Shelley, Mr. Dyce has not thought fit to preserve specimens,) there is a slight revelation also, it will be observed, of Rogers’s feeling of his *intellectual* relations, as himself a poet, to the same series of men. On this point, however, a word or two, in conclusion, expressing a more precise judgment than Rogers himself could well give, may naturally be expected.

We have spoken of that era of the poetical literature of Britain, which extends from 1786 to the present time, as being, by the admission of all, an era pervaded, notwithstanding its variations within itself, by a certain common spirit, distinguishing it as a whole from the preceding era of the eighteenth century, and distinguishing it so advantageously that even when we refer to it as the period of the *Revival of British Poetry*, we are not supposed to exaggerate. We have named, also, the men concerned with this period, and on account of whose labours, severally and conjointly, it is thus highly spoken of. We have said little, however, as to the *characteristics* of the period—as to those internal peculiarities of its poetry and creative literature generally, imparted in different proportions by the genius of the men that

have been named, which, taken together, constitute its historical difference and the cause of its historical continuity. Let us repair this defect by an observation or two stated summarily rather than verified at length. (1.) In the first place, then, we would sum up a large amount of what critics have unanimously for a long time been saying, by averring that the most general characteristic of British poetry since 1786 has been the prevalence of a spirit of literary Pre-Drydenism. All who are acquainted with the history of our literature know that the reform in the literary, and especially in the poetic art, preached and exemplified by Wordsworth in the closing decade of the last century, was essentially similar to that reform which, under the name of Pre-Raphaelitism, has recently been revolutionizing our art of painting. As the painting-reformers maintain that, in some respects, the painters who preceded Raphael worked on truer principles, both of invention and of execution, than Raphael himself, or at all events, those who came after him; so Wordsworth preached over and over again the one uniform doctrine that, from the time of Dryden to his own, the poets of Britain, with but a few exceptions, had mistaken both the meaning and the method of the poetic art. They had mistaken wit in metre, satire in metre, general manifestation of intellect in metre, for poetry; whereas poetry was a special produce of the senses, and the feelings in alliance with the imagination! In their references to nature and life, they had gone on using a stock of old images supposed to be sacred to the use of poets, without ever themselves bestowing a glance on nature's facts or life's realities! The very language they used, under the name of poetic diction, was an artificially distorted prose, the knack of writing which could be easily acquired by a clever man, but which, in no conceivable circumstances, out of the so-called poetry for which it was considered appropriate, would be used or could be used! For true specimens of English poetry—poetry, the matter of which was natural, the words and phrases natural, and the versification natural—one must go back, with a few such exceptions as Thomson and Dyer, to the poets prior to Dryden! Pre-Drydenism, therefore, (if we may coin such a term,) was Wordsworth's life-long doctrine; and no wonder that Fox, with his enthusiastic admiration of Dryden, instinctively kept off from Wordsworth as the head of a new "faction." But though Wordsworth was the first recognised head of the faction, all the new poets rising into importance in Britain about or shortly after the year 1786, were independently tinctured with the same Pre-Drydenist spirit. Crabbe, Bowles, Coleridge, Southey, and others, realized something of Wordsworth's main notion for themselves, and helped, along with Wordsworth, to develop and

diffuse it. For, in fact, just as Pre-Raphaelitism in painting may be said to divide itself into several kinds, according to the different tendencies and constitutions of the painters who adopt the one Pre-Raphaelite principle of truth to nature, so there arose two or three kinds or applications of Pre-Drydenism. For example, the Pre-Drydenism of Wordsworth himself and his Lakist associates and disciples may be distinguished as Idealist Pre-Drydenism, on account of the combination in them of highly imaginative genius with that accuracy of natural observation, and that simplicity of verbal construction, which it was the essence of Pre-Drydenism to recommend; the Pre-Drydenism of Crabbe, and those who resemble him, might, on the other hand, be named Realist Pre-Drydenism for a converse reason; while, for the poetry of Scott and his followers, so far as he had any, might be invented the name of Historical or Romantic Pre-Drydenism, to indicate its character as a third species. (2.) This generic quality of Pre-Drydenism still inhering in one or other of its forms in all our poetical literature, (though more in some cases than in others,) we have to note as a second characteristic, introduced considerably later into the British poetry of Rogers's age, and curiously blending with the now inherent Pre-Drydenism, a marvellously increased spirit of "subjectivity." Pre-Drydenism, we say, had become a settled habit of our literature—a habit, to some extent, even with those poets who, like Campbell, would have disowned the doctrine, and who fought for Dryden and Pope against Wordsworth and Bowles—when there passed athwart the face of our poetry, so re-conditioned, a certain shadow caused by an internal tumult in the newer poetic mind of the time. First came Byron with his storm and rage, bringing with him into our poetry that fierce kind of subjectivity which may be called the subjectivity of passion, of which since his day, despite the calmer influence of Wordsworth, our literature has been so full. Distinct, however, from this Byronic or passionate subjectivity was the subtle and more intellectual or metaphysical subjectivity of the Shelley school, breathed through our verse by Shelley himself, and since his time more or less affecting most of our celebrated poets.

In forming our notion of Rogers as one of the recognised British poets of an era so rich and so varied, it is necessary distinctly to remember the fact, that his first appearance as a poet took place when the era was hardly well begun. He preceded Wordsworth by six years, Bowles by three years; and Crabbe alone of the poets properly belonging to the era, was known to the public before him. In other words, he was "smitten with the love of song" at a time when the older English poets of the eighteenth century were still without rivals. It is a proof of his

true poetic sensibility, that among these poets his favourites and masters were precisely those whom even the critics of the new era regard as the most tasteful and natural—the most truly poetical. Gray, Collins, Dyer, Beattie, Goldsmith, and the Wartons, were more peculiarly his poetic teachers: and the anticipation that might have been formed of him was that, as the disciple of these poets, he would carry their smooth and pleasing style of verse into a new age, altered only in so far as there might be an element of originality in his own genius, and as this element of originality and his ideas of art might be acted upon by future contemporary influences. Now, as regards any original intellectual strength in Rogers to give a new form or direction, by his own unaided activity, to the poetry of his nation at the time when he became first acquainted with it, very little can be said. His own estimate of his original endowments, appended to his *Italy*, is modestly conceived; but there is no reason to reject it as inadequate:—

“Nature denied him much,  
But gave him at his birth what most he valued,—  
A passionate love for music, sculpture, painting,  
For poetry, the language of the gods,  
For all things here, or grand or beautiful,  
A setting sun, a lake among the mountains,  
The light of an ingenuous countenance,  
And, what transcends them all, a noble action.”

In short, at the commencement of his poetical career, Rogers was simply a youth of fine tastes and affections, who, without possessing powers equal to those of the Grays and the Goldsmiths in whom he delighted, could write musical and truly pleasing verses somewhat in their vein. If there was anything in him which, independently of influences from without, might have imparted a certain difference to his poetry as compared with that amid which he was formed, it was a certain touch of that Pre-Drydenism which seemed then to be hanging in the air, and affecting all rising poets, though it was reserved for Wordsworth formally to realize its influence. Rogers *had* acquired for himself the habit of referring to nature and using only really perceived phenomena when he attempted to describe scenery; he *had* an instinctive feeling that the matter of real poetry must be matter as treated by the imagination; and he had also found out for himself the absurdity of that notion of poetic diction which Wordsworth afterwards satirized, and the superiority of the versification of some of our older poets to that which Dryden had introduced. It was, probably, because he had done all this to some extent before Bowles and Wordsworth were heard

of, that Mason spoke of his early poems as being "different in style from the poetry of the day." But though there was thus in Rogers a touch of native Pre-Drydenism, it was but a touch, and, if left to himself, he would not have carried the revolution far. It was not, in fact, till after Crabbe and Bowles and Wordsworth and Coleridge, had made their joint influence felt, that Rogers knew that a revolution had taken place at all, and that the Gray and Goldsmith era was at an end. He did not then hesitate to class himself with the Pre-Drydenists, and, in composing new poems, to submit himself to their influence. By the Realist Pre-Drydenism of Crabbe, indeed, he was scarcely affected; but his style corresponded sufficiently with that of Wordsworth and the Lakists to cause him to be regarded as one of that body, and to be on friendly terms with its members; and even Scott's Minstrel Poetry did not come too late to give him new inspiration. Still to the end of his life, as our quotations from the *Table-Talk* will have shewn, Rogers was by no means such a zealot of Pre-Drydenism as Wordsworth, Southey, Coleridge, Bowles, and others, with whom, by the general style of his poems, he was most closely associated. He never gave up Dryden, or Pope, or Gray, or any other of the eighteenth century poets. Nor in his own practice, with all his laborious slowness, did he ever attain to what the more zealous Pre-Drydenists would have admitted to be the perfection of diction and versification. Always smooth, and careful, and musical, his verse is by no means free from those faults of incoherent metaphor, and a distortion of the natural order of the words, which Wordsworth tried to banish from our poetry. Perhaps it was the laxness of his Pre-Drydenism that made him, when already past the meridian of life, so willing to welcome the poetry of Byron. But though, for a time, he was so intimately associated with Byron, as even to publish one of his poems in the same volume with one of Byron's, nothing of the true Byronic influence passed into his poetry. Such "subjectivity" as Rogers had was but that of a natural pensiveness and disposition to the meditative; and of that there had been examples in Wordsworth and the Lakists before Byron came. Much less was it likely that Rogers, at the same advanced period of life, could become subject to the Shelley influence. His own small metaphysics, as we have said, had already long ago been made up; and, content to the end with the practice of that tasteful and classic kind of verse which he had learnt from Gray and Goldsmith in his youth, he must have regarded the various developments of Shelley's poetry, by which he was surrounded in his extreme old age as strange, unintelligible mist.

- ART. VI.—1. *Microgeologie, das Erden und Felsen schaffende Wirken, des unsichtbar kleinen selbständigen Lebens auf der Erde.* Von CHRISTIAN GOTTFRIED EHRENBURG. With Forty Folio Plates. 1 vol. fol. Leipzig, 1854. Pp. 500.
2. *The Micrographic Dictionary, a Guide to the Examination and Investigation of Microscopic Objects.* By J. W. GRIFFITH, M.D., and ARTHUR HENFREY, F.R.S. Illustrated by 41 Plates and 816 Woodcuts. 8vo. Lond. 1856. Pp. 810.
3. *The Microscope and its Revelations.* By WILLIAM R. CARPENTER, M.D., F.R.S. Illustrated with 345 Wood Engravings. Lond. 1856. Pp. 778.
4. *The Microscope.* By DIONYSIUS LARDNER, D.C.L. From the Museum of Science and Art. With 147 Engravings. Lond. 1856.
5. *A Practical Treatise for the Use of the Microscope, including the different Methods of Preparing and Examining Animal, Vegetable, and Mineral Structures.* By JOHN QUEKETT. Illustrated with Nine Plates, and 241 Woodcut Engravings. Lond. 1848. Pp. 454.
6. *The Microscopic Cabinet of Select Animated Objects, with a Description of the Jewel and Doublet Microscope, Test Objects, &c. With Thirteen Coloured Plates and numerous Engravings on Wood.* By ANDREW PRITCHARD. Lond. 1832. Pp. 246.
7. *The Natural History of Animalculæ, with Instructions for Procuring and Viewing them. Illustrated by upwards of 300 magnified figures on steel.* By ANDREW PRITCHARD, Esq. Lond. 1836. Pp. 196.
8. *Micrographia, containing Practical Essays on Reflecting, Solar, Oxyhydrogen Gas, Microscopes, Micrometers, Eyepieces, &c.* By C. R. GORING, M.D., and ANDREW PRITCHARD, Esq., M.R.I. Lond. 1837. Pp. 231.
9. *Microscopic Illustrations of Living Objects, with Researches concerning the Methods of Constructing Microscopes, and Instructions for Using them. With Coloured Engravings and Woodcuts.* Third Edition. By ANDREW PRITCHARD, Esq., M.R.I., &c. Lond. 1845. Pp. 296.
10. *A History of Infusorial Animalcules, Living and Fossil. With 24 Plates.* By ANDREW PRITCHARD, M.R.I. New edit. Lond. 1852. Pp. 720.
11. *Lectures on Histology.* By JOHN QUEKETT. With 59 Woodcuts. Lond. 1852. Pp. 216.

THERE was a time in the history of science and civilisation, when the human eye was the only instrument by which man could view and investigate the works of his Maker. To objects remote in distance and gigantic in magnitude, he was hopelessly blind, and equally blind to everything minute in size, and within

the range both of his sight and of his touch. The light of the remotest planets of his system never reached his eye, and all the secondary planets but his own were equally invisible. Had it been told to the sages of ancient times, that what was invisible and almost infinitely distant, would one day be distinctly seen and submitted to his scrutiny; and that bodies which were almost infinitely small, would appear in colossal proportions, and reveal structures unseen before, they would have pronounced the prediction to be ridiculous, and the prophet insane. Reason in its highest form could not have anticipated a power so extraordinary, and imagination, in its wildest mood, would have ranked it as a dream. So singular, indeed, is the position of the telescope and the microscope, among the great inventions of the age, that no other instrument, and no other process but that which they embody, could make the slightest approximation to the secrets which they disclose. The steam-engine might have been imperfectly replaced by an air or an ether engine, and a highly elastic fluid might have been, and may yet be, found, which shall impel the "rapid car," or drag the merchant ship over the globe. The electric telegraph, now so perfect and unerring, might have spoken to us in the rude "language of chimes," as suggested by its first inventor;\* or sound, in place of electricity, might have passed along the metallic path, and appealed to the ear in place of the eye. Even the printing press and the typographic art might have found a substitute, however poor, in the lithographic process; and knowledge might have been widely diffused by the photographic printing powers of the sun, or even artificial light; but without the telescope and the microscope, the human eye would have struggled in vain to study the worlds beyond our own, and the elaborate structures of the organic and inorganic creation would never have been revealed.

Previous to the invention of glass, the telescopes and microscopes of the present day could not have been constructed, even if their theory had been known; but it seems strange that a variety of facts which must have presented themselves to the most careless observer, should not have led to the earlier construction of optical instruments. The art of working metals, which was known and extensively practised in the earliest ages, must have given rise to phenomena suggestive of magnifying power, if not of telescopic vision. It cannot admit of a doubt, that the ancients must have formed metallic articles with concave surfaces, in which the observer could not fail to see himself magnified, and if the radius of the concavity exceeded twelve inches, twice the focal distance of his eye, he had in his hands an extempore reflecting telescope of the Newtonian form, in

---

\* See this *Journal*, vol. xxii. p. 549.

which the concave metal was the speculum, and his eye the eye-glass, and which would magnify and bring near him the images of objects nearly behind him. Through the spherical drops of water suspended before his eye, an attentive observer might have seen magnified some minute body placed accidentally in its anterior focus, and in the eyes of fishes and quadrupeds which he used for his food, he might have seen, and might have extracted, the beautiful lenses which they contain, and which he could not fail to regard as the principal agents in the vision of the animals to which they belonged. Curiosity might have prompted him to look through these remarkable lenses or spheres, and had he placed the lens of the smallest minnow, or that of the bird, the sheep, or the ox, in or before a circular aperture, he would have possessed a microscope or microscopes of excellent quality and different magnifying powers. No such observations, however, seem to have been made, and even after the invention of glass and its conversion into globular vessels, through which, when filled with any fluid, objects are magnified, the microscope remained undiscovered.

The earliest magnifying lens of which we have any knowledge, was one rudely made of rock-crystal, which Mr. Layard found among a number of glass bowls in the North-west Palace of Nimroud;\* but no similar lens has been found or described, to induce us to believe that the microscope, either single or compound, was invented and used as an instrument previous to the commencement of the seventeenth century. In the beginning of the first century, however, Seneca alludes to the magnifying power of a glass globe filled with water; but as he only states that it made small and indistinct letters appear larger and more distinct, we cannot consider such a casual remark as the invention of the single microscope, though it might have led the observer to try the effect of smaller globes, and thus obtain magnifying powers sufficient to discover phenomena otherwise invisible.†

\* See this *Journal*, vol. xix. p. 269.

† Upon examining this passage it does not distinctly appear that the glass globe was used as a magnifier in the experiment of Seneca, as the effect is ascribed to the water and not to the glass. "Illud adjiciam, omnia per aquam videntibus longe esse majora. Literæ quamvis minutæ et obscure per vitream pilam aquæ plenam majores clariioresque cernuntur. Poma formosiora quam sint videntur, si innant vitro. Sidera ampliora per nubem adspicienti videntur, quia acies nostra in humido labitur, nec apprehendere quod vult fideliter potest. Quod manifestum fiet si poculum impleveris aquâ et in id conjeceris annulum. Nam cum in ipso fundo jaceat annulus, facies ejus in summo aquæ redditur. Quicquid ridetur per humorem longe amplius vero est. Quid mirum majorem reddi imaginem solis quæ in nube humida visitur, cum de causis duabus hoc accidat? quia in nube aliquid vitro simile quod potest perlucere, est aliquid et aquæ, quam si nondum habet, tamen jam apparet ejus natura in quam ex sua vertatur."—L. A. Seneca Opera, Nat. Quest. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 837. Paris, 1607. The *literæ minutæ et obscure*, when placed in the glass globe, would appear more distinct by the water increasing

Lenses of glass were undoubtedly in existence in the time of Pliny, but at that period, and for many centuries afterwards, they appear to have been used only as burning, or as reading glasses, and no attempt seems to have been made to form them of so small a size as to entitle them to be regarded even as the precursors of the single microscope.

As in all great inventions, we can hardly venture to ascribe that of the microscope to any single individual. No person, indeed, has claimed to be the inventor of the single microscope; and though the pretensions of two Dutchmen and two Italians to the invention of the compound microscope have been urged by their respective countrymen, it is not easy to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on the subject. According to Peter Borell, the Jansens, spectacle-makers at Middleburg, invented the compound microscope in 1590, and presented the first instrument to Charles-Albert, Archduke of Austria. The Dutch have claimed the invention for Cornelius Drebell of Alkmaar, who resided in London as mathematician to James VI. Fontana, an Italian, made the same claim for himself, while Viviani, the pupil of Galileo, ascribed the invention to his master. In the following decision upon these contending claims, given by the illustrious Huygens, we are disposed to place some confidence, even though he pleads in favour of a countryman of his own. After giving it as his opinion that the single microscope was invented not long after the telescope, and ten years earlier than the compound microscope, he says,—“It does not appear that compound microscopes were known in the year 1618, because Hieronymus Syrturus, who published a book in that year on the origin and construction of the telescope, would not have passed by in silence so remarkable an invention, had it been at that time known. Francis Fontana, indeed, arrogates it to himself in a book of Observations published in 1646; but the testimony of Hieronymus Syrsalis, which he brings forward, does not go farther back than the year 1625. In 1621, however, microscopes of this kind were seen in the possession of our countryman Drebel, at London, in Britain, and those who were present have often told me this, and also that he was the first inventor of them.”\*

their blackness like a varnish, in the same manner as the apples, and would be magnified by the curved surface of the globe next the eye. Obscure letters could not be made more distinct by looking at them through a glass globe filled with water.

\* See Christiani Hugenii *Dioptrica*, p. 221; Lugd. Bat., 1703. In quoting this simple fact from Sir D. Brewster's *Treatise on the Microscope*, that Drebell possessed one of Jansen's microscopes, Mr. Quekett has inadvertently added to the quotation in inverted commas the following passage:—“In which place (meaning London) Drebel made microscopes, and passed them off as being of his invention.” This passage is not in the *Treatise* from which it professes to be taken. It would

The assertion made by Viviani\* that Galileo was led to the discovery of the microscope from that of the telescope, and that he sent one to Casimir, king of Poland, in 1612, has been repeated with many additional circumstances in the General Preface to the works of Galileo,† published at Milan in 1808. The author of the Preface states that Galileo invented the microscope and the telescope about the same time, and that he applied the former to examine objects otherwise invisible. The instrument consisted, like the telescope, of a convex and a concave lens, and also of one lens more convex; and exhibited the structure of insects, and made visible things of prodigious littleness. He corrects what he supposes a mistake of Viviani, in asserting that Galileo sent a microscope in 1612 to Casimir, king of Poland, whereas he says it was sent to Sigismund. Now Casimir was not king of Poland till 1648, six years after Galileo's death, and from this circumstance alone, Italian writers have substituted the name of Sigismund, who was the only king of Poland who flourished in the time of Galileo. But Viviani must have known that Sigismund was king of Poland at that time, and it is, therefore, more likely that he has committed no mistake, and that he meant to state that Galileo sent the microscope to Casimir who was king of Poland at the time he was writing. Admitting, therefore, the correctness of Viviani's statement, that Galileo sent a microscope to Casimir or Sigismund in 1612, this does not prove that he was the inventor of it. He might have made it in imitation of Jansen's, as he did the telescope; but we think it more probable that 1612 is an erroneous date, perhaps an error of the press for 1622, and in support of this opinion we may state that in 1624 Galileo sent a microscope to Frederigo Cesi, the founder of the Lyncean Academy, and in the letter which accompanied it, dated 23d September, he apologizes for the delay in sending it, as he had not brought it to perfection, and had experienced much difficulty in the process of working the lenses perfectly. In the same month and year, he sends another to

have been difficult, on any supposition, to reconcile the date of 1617, when he is said to have constructed microscopes in London, whether as his own invention, or in imitation of those of Jansen, with the claim made by Huygens of his having invented the instrument in 1621; but it is pretty obvious, from the testimony of William Borell, that Drebell never claimed to be the inventor of the microscope. This gentleman, who was Dutch ambassador in 1619, writes to his brother Peter, the historian of the telescope, that Drebell, with whom he was intimately acquainted, shewed him a microscope, which he said was the same that the Archduke had given him, and had been made by Jansen himself. It was said to be six feet long. This statement is irreconcilable with that of Huygens. See Borellus, *De vero Telescopii Inventore*, p. 35.

\* In his Life of Galileo, at the end of his work, *De Locis Solidis*.

† *Opere di Galileo Galilei*, vol. I. pp. 125-130.

Bartolomeo Imperiali; and a third, two months afterwards, to Cæsar Marsili, a nobleman of Bologna. There is no evidence, therefore, excepting the statement of Viviani, which is wrong in one essential point, that he had a microscope in 1612, and the fact that he presented microscopes to his friends in 1624, makes it highly probable that he had not previously constructed them.

From these conflicting statements, it is obvious that no single individual can be considered as the inventor of the microscope. As soon as two lenses were combined to magnify distant objects, it was impossible to overlook their influence in the examination of objects that were near, and it is highly probable that the different individuals whom we have mentioned may have had the merit of inventing, constructing, and using the microscope.

In proceeding to give a popular account of the various inventions by which the microscope has been brought to its present state of perfection, and become one of the most valuable instruments in extending almost every branch of science,—and to give a brief notice of some of its more important and striking revelations, we shall adopt the following arrangement:—

1. On the Single Microscope.
2. On Microscopic Doublets and Triplets.
3. On the Compound Microscope.
4. On the Polarizing Microscope.
5. On the Preparation of Microscopic Objects.
6. On the Illumination of Microscopic Objects.
7. On the Methods of drawing Objects in the Microscope.
8. On the Revelations of the Microscope.

In this extensive survey, though necessarily brief, from the limitation of our space, we shall endeavour to do justice to the ingenious men, whether philosophers or artists, who have devoted themselves to this branch of science; and we shall be careful, as far as our information goes, neither to omit nor to suppress the names, as has been most improperly done by some of the writers of the works in our list, of those eminent individuals who have made any real contribution to the improvement of the microscope.

**I. THE SINGLE MICROSCOPE.**—When a sound eye of the average power, neither long-sighted nor short-sighted, examines any object in order to see it most distinctly, the observer places the object at the distance of about *six* inches, and in this position it is seen of its natural size, and is not said to be magnified. If we hold up at this distance a finger three-fourths of an inch broad, it will appear to cover upon a wall ten feet distant a space of fifteen inches. If we hold it up at three inches from the eye, it will cover a space of thirty inches, and will appear *twice* as large,

and if we hold it up at the distance of an inch and a half, it will cover a space of sixty inches, and will appear four times as large. But though magnified in these two last positions, it is not seen distinctly, and therefore we see it more imperfectly than we saw it at the distance of *six* inches. These observations lead us to the simplest of all microscopes, which a child may make for himself.

1. *The Single-Aperture Microscope.*—If we now look at the finger, when seen indistinctly at the distances of three, and one and a half, inches from the eye, through a small pinhole in a piece of card, it will appear not only magnified, but tolerably distinct, and the distinctness will increase with the smallness of the aperture. The most satisfactory aperture is one made with a needle in a piece of sheet-lead or tinfoil, and when the eye is applied close to it, the vision will be such, that discoveries of rude structures, invisible to the eye, might be made by the observer.

This little aperture has another and a more valuable property. If imperfect vision, or even blindness, is produced by a disorganization of the cornea or the crystalline lens, and if there is the *smallest spot* in either in a sound state, the little aperture held opposite to that spot will give distinct vision of external objects, the plate in which it is made shutting out the confused light produced by the disorganized parts of the cornea or crystalline lens, in which the few correctly refracted pencils are lost.

2. *The Single Glass Sphere Microscope.*—A single sphere of glass, from the twentieth to the fiftieth of an inch in diameter, forms a good microscope, with which many interesting phenomena may be observed, and even important discoveries made. Dr. Hooke seems to have been the first person who made microscopes of this kind. Having taken a clear piece of glass, he drew it out, by the heat of a lamp, into fine threads, and then holding the ends of these threads in the flame, he melted them till they run into a small round globule, which hung to the end of the thread. The globule is then stuck on the end of a piece of wood with the thread cut as short as possible, standing up-permost, and the ends are ground off, first on a whetstone, and then polished on a metal plate with tripoli. When the glass sphere is thus finished, it is placed against a small hole made in a thin piece of metal, and fixed with wax. Thus fitted up, Dr. Hooke says that “it will both magnify and make some objects more distinct than any of the great microscopes can do.”

Another method of making these glass spheres is to take up, on the point of a wetted wire, several small fragments of crown or plate glass, and hold them in the flame of a lamp till they fall down in the form of a small globule.

Mr. Stephen Gray\* made these small spheres by melting little pieces of glass placed upon charcoal, by means of the blow-pipe; but he did not always succeed, as the globules were frequently flattened or rendered opaque on the side next the charcoal.

The next improver of the single glass sphere microscope was a Mr. Butterfield, a friend of the celebrated Cassini, and "Mathematique Instrument-maker to the French king." After mentioning that they were busy in Paris "making microscopes of the manner lately brought out of Holland by Mr. Huygens," he gives the following interesting method of making glass spheres: \*—

"I have tried several ways for the making of glasses of the bigness of a great pin's head and less; as in the flame of a tallow candle, and of one of wax. But the best way of all I have yet found to make them clear and without specks, is with the flame of spirit of wine, well rectified and burned in a lamp. Instead of cotton I make use of very small silver wire, doubled up and down like a skein of thread, which, being wet with the spirit of wine and made to burn in the lamp, giveth through the verle of the lamp a very ardent flame. Then take your beaten glass, being first washed very clean, upon the point of a silver needle filed very small, and wet with spittle. Hold it thus in the flame till it be quite round, and no longer, for fear of burning it; and if the side of the glass next the needle be not melted, you may put it off and take it up with the needle on the round side, presenting the rough side to the flame till it be everywhere very round and smooth, then wipe or rub one or several of them together with soft leather, which makes them much the better. Then put them between two pieces of thin brass, the apertures very round and without bur, and that towards the eye so big almost as the diameter of the glass; and so placed in a frame with the object conveniently for observation."

About three quarters of a century later, Father di Torre, of Naples, made single sphere lenses of great accuracy and power, and applied them to the examination of the blood corpuscles and the seeds of plants. In 1761 he sent to the Royal Society a box containing four of the following size and powers:—

Glass.	Diameter.		Magnifying Power.
Glass 1,	2 Paris Points,	$\frac{3}{8}$ Inch,	640.
" 2,	1 "	$\frac{7}{8}$ "	1280.
" 3,	1 "	$\frac{7}{8}$ "	1280.
" 4,	$\frac{1}{2}$ "	$1\frac{1}{2}$ "	2560.

These lenses were made in the flame of a lamp, "*igne purissime*," which is all the information conveyed in the letter of Sir F. H. Eyles Stiles to the Royal Society. He remarks, how-

\* *Phil. Trans.* No. cccxi. p. 280.

† *Phil. Trans.* 1678, No. cxi. p. 1026.

ever, that "the making of them was soon done, that he makes many before he produces one to his mind," which must be "without flaw or speck, and perfectly spherical." With lenses thus made, and with powers varying from 42 to 1280 diameters, Di Torre executed 38 drawings of the seeds of plants which are engraven by the Royal Society, and which appear to be the first important observation in natural history made by melted globules of glass.\*

However skilfully made, the figure of these globules is not perfectly spherical, and from their small size there is much trouble in fixing them, even when they are well made, in the plate of metal. The late Mr. Sivright of Meggetland† was, therefore, led to adopt another method free from these defects. In a piece of platinum leaf, about the thickness of tinfoil, he made two or three holes from the twentieth to the tenth of an inch in diameter, and at the distance of half an inch from each other. In these holes he put little pieces of glass which stuck in them without falling through, and which were thick enough nearly to fill the apertures. When the glass is melted with a blowpipe, it runs into a lens which adheres strongly to the metal, so that the lens is formed and set at the same time. The pieces of glass thus used should have no marks upon them of a file or a diamond. An eye or loop made circular by bending a platinum wire round a cylinder, may be used instead of a platinum leaf.

3. *The Single-Lens Microscope.*—The celebrated Leuenhoeck, who made so many important discoveries with the single microscope, was supposed to have used only glass globules formed by fusion; but Mr. Baker,‡ who had upon his table when he wrote, the *twenty-six microscopes* which Leuenhoeck left as a legacy to the Royal Society, informs us that a double convex lens, and not a sphere or globule, was in each of them. These small lenses are ground and polished by the hand like all other lenses, and when the radii of their surfaces are as *one to six*, they make very good microscopes. Leuenhoeck placed the lenses between two plates of silver, perforated with a small hole, and having before it a moveable pin upon which to place the object, and adjust it to distinct vision.§ With magnifying powers, varying from 40 to 160, Leuenhoeck made such important discoveries that the compound microscope was laid aside for a time, and superseded in England for many years by the ingenious pocket microscope of J. Wilson,|| which for nearly three quarters of a century was manufactured in England.

\* See *Phil. Trans.*, 1765, vol. iv. pp. 246-270, and Plates viii. and ix.

† *Edin. Phil. Journal*, vol. i. p. 82.

‡ *Of Microscopes, and the Discoveries made thereby*, vol. i. p. 7, note.

§ See *Phil. Trans.*, 1673 and 1740.

|| *Id. Id.*, 1702.

The single lenses for microscopes may be formed even by fusion. Mr. Sivright,\* who first suggested this process, succeeded in making tolerably good plano-convex lenses. In order to do this, he took a plate of New Holland topaz, with a perfectly flat and perfectly polished surface of cleavage which is easily obtained; and having laid upon it a fragment of glass, he exposed the whole to an intense heat. The upper surface of the melted glass assumed a spherical surface, and the lower surface became perfectly flat and highly polished, from its contact with the smaller surface of the topaz. In making these lenses, care must be taken that no cavities are contained in the plate of topaz, as these cavities always contain volatile fluids which expand by heat, and make the topaz explode with great force.

In the single-lens microscope, the vision may be greatly improved by placing a very small aperture between the lens and the object, which diminishes the spherical and chromatic observation. The light is, of course, diminished with the aperture, but it is easy to compensate this by using a strong light.

4. *The single lens Water Microscope.*—Mr. Stephen Gray, above a century and a half ago, constructed single microscopes with drops of water which he lifted up on the point of a pin, and placed in a small hole made in a piece of brass. The hole, about the 30th of an inch in diameter, was then filled with a double convex lens of water, the correct figure and value of which depended upon the uniform smoothness and cleanness of the circular edge of the aperture. In the apparatus used by Mr. Gray, the axis of the lens was horizontal, so that the weight of the drop, small as it was, had a tendency to destroy its spherical form. Its performance would have been greatly improved by looking through it in a vertical direction. By using oils and varnishes, which have a much higher refractive power than water, Mr. Gray would have obtained lenses of a more perfect form, and with a higher magnifying power.

5. *Fluid Lenses of Oil and Varnish.*—In order to avoid the injurious influence of gravity and of inequalities in the capillary action of the circular margin of the aperture, Sir David Brewster long ago constructed fluid lenses by placing very minute drops of pure turpentine varnish, honey, Canada balsam, castor oil, and other viscid fluids, on plates of very thin and parallel glass. In this way he formed plano-convex lenses of any desired focal length; and by dropping the fluid on both sides, he formed double convex lenses with their convexities in any required proportion. By a particular process he made the axes of the two plano-convex lenses perfectly coincident, and by freeing the

---

\* *Edin. Phil. Journal*, Vol. i. p. 88.

glass carefully from grease with a solution of soda, the margin of the lenses became correctly circular. When the plate of glass was placed perfectly horizontal, the only effect of gravity which diminishes with the viscosity of the fluid, and with the smallness of the drop, is to elongate the lower lens, and give it a hyperbolic form, (the best possible for lenses,) and to flatten the upper one. The plano-convex lenses might be placed on separate plates of glass, the one plate being laid upon the other so as to make the axes of the lenses coincident, a small aperture in thin lead or tinfoil being placed between the plates to exclude the action of the marginal parts of the lenses. In forming these lenses it is not necessary that they should be of the same size, or even of the same fluid. The lens made of the most viscid fluid should be placed uppermost to diminish the flattening effect of gravity, and the least viscid fluid placed lowermost to increase that effect, and produce a form more hyperbolic. In laying down these lenses, the needle or wire which suspends the drop of fluid is made to descend vertically by means of a rack and pinion movement till it just touches the glass, and is moved quickly back again when a sufficient portion of the fluid has been deposited.

When we wish to deposit minute drops of fluid upon a polished surface, in order to make a fluid microscope of very high magnifying power, we experience a very peculiar difficulty. The fluid adheres so tenaciously to the tenderest fibre, such as one of spun glass, that it is impossible to detach it. It runs along the fibre, and will not quit it. This arises from the smallness of the quantity of fluid, as well as from its force of adhesion to the fibre. These difficulties were overcome by a suitable mixture of two fluids, such as Canada balsam and castor oil, and by driving the fluid to the extremity of the fibre by successive jerks of the hand in which it was held. Having thus succeeded in obtaining lenses so small as to be hardly recognised by the eye, which remained perfect more than a year, when protected from dust, our author next endeavoured to make the figure of larger fluid lenses approximate to the hyperbolic form, and obtained results which exceeded his expectations. If fluids could be had of a high reflective and low dispersive power, and not of a volatile nature, simple microscopes of extreme perfection might be constructed.

7. *Single Microscopes of Precious Stones.*—Sir David Brewster was the first person who pointed out the value of precious stones in the construction of microscopes.\* Having experienced the greatest difficulty in getting a small diamond cut into a prism in London, he did think it practicable to grind and polish a

---

\* *Treatise on New Phil. Instruments*, 1813, pp. 402, 403.

diamond lens, and contented himself with having lenses of *ruby* and *garnet* executed by the late Mr. P. Hill, an ingenious Edinburgh optician, which he found greatly superior to those of glass.

In 1824, Dr. Goring, a most ardent improver of the microscope, directed the attention of Mr. Pritchard to the passages in the work just quoted, respecting the value of the precious stones for single microscopes, and he immediately undertook to execute them. In this arduous attempt, Mr. Pritchard experienced several failures, but in December 1824, he completed a diamond microscope which excited the admiration of Mr. Levi, the foreman of the Dutch diamond-cutters in Messrs. Rundell and Bridge's establishment, and which Dr. Goring, who tried it both in a single microscope, and as the object-glass of a compound microscope, tells us, "shewed the most difficult transparent objects," and would, when finished, be "amazingly superior to other lenses." Some time afterwards, Mr. Pritchard executed two plano-convex lenses of very perfect diamond, one the twentieth of an inch focus, which was purchased by the late Duke of Buckingham, and another the 30th of an inch focus.\*

The other precious stones fitted for microscopes are ruby, sapphire, garnet, zircon, topaz, and rock crystal; but the diamond, when pure and homogeneous, and the garnet and spinelle ruby, which have no double refraction, are the most suitable. Mr. Pritchard has made excellent lenses of sapphire, and lenses of garnet and spinelle have been executed by Scotch opticians, Mr. Hill, Mr. Adie, Mr. Blaikie of Edinburgh, and Mr. Veitch of Jedburgh.

The durability of lenses made of precious stones is one of their greatest recommendations. Lenses of glass undergo decomposition, and lose their polish in the course of time. Mr. Baker found the glass lenses of Leuenhoeck utterly useless after they became the property of the Royal Society. The glass articles found in Nimroud were decomposed, while the rock crystal lens was uninjured.

8. *Catadioptric Lenses*.—In this new form of lenses, as proposed by Sir David Brewster, the effect is produced by two refractions and one reflexion. A glass hemisphere, or a plano-convex lens, whose diameter is twice its thickness, when used in the common way, has a certain magnifying power, but if we place its flat side at an angle of  $45^\circ$  to the horizon, and look down through its upper part, we shall see an object, placed horizontally, by means of rays totally reflected from its plane surface. In this way of

\* *Microscopic Cabinet*, p. 107, and *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, New Series, No. 1, p. 149.

using the hemisphere, we have converted it into two convex lenses, and doubled its magnifying power. The same effect is produced as if we had placed two perfectly equal plano-convex lenses on the two smaller faces of a rectangular prism.\*

8. *The Grooved Sphere Microscope*.—This globular microscope derives its name from having a deep groove cut round its equator on a plane perpendicular to the axis of vision. Sir David Brewster† was led to its construction by the microscopic doublet of Dr. Wollaston, to be afterwards described. When parallel rays of light are refracted by a sphere, those which pass along the axis are brought to a focus much nearer the sphere than those which pass at a distance from the axis, so that vision through a microscope of this form is necessarily indistinct. By excavating a deep groove round its equator, we cut off all those rays that fall on the outer parts of the anterior hemisphere, and thus remove the principal cause of indistinct vision. Grooved spheres of this kind were executed for the inventor out of glass and garnet, and found to be excellent microscopes. The late Mr. Coddington of Cambridge, who had a high opinion of the value of this contrivance, got one of the grooved spheres executed by Mr. Carey, optician in London, who gave it the name of the Coddington Lens, supposing that it was invented by the person who employed him, whereas Mr. Coddington never laid claim to it, and never made any reference to such a lens till nine years after it was described in the Edinburgh Journal.‡

9. *The Semilens and Sector Microscopes*.—A semilens is made by cutting a common lens into two halves with a diamond. In this way we obtain two lenses perfectly equal in all their properties, a result of great value in optics. These lenses have an important application in the lenticular stereoscope; but by cutting lenses into two, three, four, or any other number of parts, and uniting them in pairs, we may obtain from one lens a compound lens magnifying twice, thrice, four times as much as it did when single. The original lens is cut along a diameter, or, in some cases, a radius of its disc, and each pair is composed as follows, the original being supposed to have a focal length of half an inch, and a magnifying power of six times.

\* See *Edin. Phil. Journal*, 1820, vol. iii. p. 74.

† See *Edin. Phil. Journal*, 1820, vol. iii. p. 75.

‡ See Coddington's *Optics*, Part I. 1829, p. 146, and Fig. 104, 105, and Part II., 1830, p. 54, note; and Brewster's *Treatise on Optics*, Edit. 1853, pp. 469, 470.

Single Lens.	Inclination of Radii.	Magnifying power of its Sectors when combined.
.....	...	6
of focus,	180°	12
—	120°	18
—	90°	24
—	60°	36
—	45°	48

In these combinations the angular point of one sector will touch the middle of the arch of the other, and the circular portions of each pair will slide into a tube of the same diameter as the radius of the sectors. The combination of these sector lenses will be more easily effected when the original is plano-convex, and the plane sides are placed in contact with a transparent cement. Each pair will thus be an equi-convex lens; but it is obvious that we may combine the sectors of any one lens with those of another of a different focus, and by interposing a proper fluid, we may correct both the achromatic and the spherical aberrations, the fluid in small lenses being kept in its place by capillary attraction. This method of combining divided lenses will enable us to make two or more microscopes or telescopes which shall have exactly the same magnifying power, an effect which cannot otherwise be produced.\*

10. *The Bottle or Tube Microscope.*—When a microscope cannot be obtained for some special purpose, a tolerably good *extempore* one may be made by filling with water, or any other fluid, two small bottles or test tubes, crossing them at right angles, and looking through the crossed parts.†

11. *The Fish-Eye Microscope.*—Very good single microscopes may be made with the crystalline lenses of fishes, birds, and quadrupeds. As the lens of fishes is spherical or spheroidal, it is absolutely necessary, previous to their use, to determine its optical axis, or the axis of vision of the eye from which it is taken, and place the lens in such a manner that its axis is a continuation of the axis of our own eye. In no other direction but this is the albumen of which the lens consists symmetrically disposed in laminae of equal density round a given line, which is the axis of the lens, and in no other direction does the gradation of density, by which the spherical aberration is corrected, preserve a proper relation to the axis of vision.

When the lens of any small fish, such as a minnow, a par, or trout, has been taken out, along with the adhering vitreous humour, from the eyeball, by cutting the sclerotic coat with a pair of scissors, it should be placed upon a piece of fine silver paper, previously freed from its minute adhering fibres. The absorbent nature of the paper will assist in removing all the

\* See Brewster's *Treatise on Optics*, edit. of 1853, p. 471.

† *Id.*, p. 422.

vitreous humour from the lens; and when this is carefully done, by rolling it about with another piece of silver paper, there will still remain, round or near the equator of the lens, a black ridge, consisting of the processes by which it was suspended in the eyeball. The black circle points out to us the true axis of the lens, which is perpendicular to a plane passing through it. When the small crystalline has been freed from all the adhering vitreous humour, the capsule which contains it will have a surface as fine as a pollicle of fluid. It is then to be dropped from the paper into a cavity formed by a brass rim raised upon a circular plate of brass, and its position changed till the black circle is parallel to the circular rim, in which case only the axis of the lens will be a continuation of the axis of the observer's eye.\*

12. *Single Reflecting Microscope.*—The single reflecting microscope, which is a concave metallic speculum, has been used principally to magnify the eye of the observer, or any part of it not far from the pupil, when he looks into the speculum. In this case the image is formed on the retina by the parallel rays which enter the eye. For this purpose, the form of the speculum should be parabolic.

If we place a transparent object in one of the conjugate foci of a concave speculum, and if the unassisted eye looks at the image in the other focus, it will be magnified in the ratio of the distance of the object to that of the image from the speculum, the image increasing in size and distance as the object approaches to the speculum. In this case, though the speculum is in one sense a single microscope, yet it is actually a double one, the eye acting as the eye-piece, and the speculum as the object-metal. When thus used, the form of the speculum must be elliptical, the object and image occupying the two foci of the ellipse.

Mr. Stephen Gray made a microscope of this kind by forming a concave surface of mercury in the following manner:—Having dissolved a small portion of quicksilver in a mixture of one part of nitric acid (aqua fortis) and ten parts of water, he rubbed with it the inner surface of a brass ring one-thirtieth of an inch thick, and having its inner diameter about two-fifths of an inch. The surface having thus become silvered, he wiped it dry, and having laid it upon a table, and put a drop of quicksilver into it, he pressed it with his finger to the ring, and formed a *convex* speculum. If the ring and speculum are now taken up carefully, carried horizontally, and laid on the margin of a hollow cylinder, the mercury will sink down by its gravity, and form a *concave* speculum, with its axis perpendicular to the horizon. An object placed in one of its conjugate foci will be seen, by the eye, in the

---

\* *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, Jan. 1825, vol. ii. p. 98.

other focus, magnified in the ratio of the distances of the object and image from the speculum.\*

We have dwelt thus long on single microscopes, and the methods of making them, which may be easily practised by persons of ordinary ingenuity who are not opticians, because there is no kind of mechanical occupation more amusing and instructive to the young than that which is connected with science, and displays to the ardent and inquiring mind phenomena and truths of which they had no previous conception. Many a young aspirant after knowledge has been led to fame by the early use of the telescope and microscope before he knew their mode of operation; and while practice in youth has led to theory in manhood, "philosophy in sport has become science in earnest." †

II. MICROSCOPIC DOUBLETS AND TRIPLETS.—The name *doublet* has been given to two lenses placed in contact, or at a small distance from each other.

1. *The Periscopic Microscope.* In 1812, Dr. Wollaston proposed a doublet in which the glasses were in contact under the name of a *Periscopic Microscope*: ‡—

"The great desideratum," says he, "in employing high magnifiers, is sufficiency of light, and it is accordingly expedient to make the aperture of the little lens as large as is consistent with distinct vision. But if the object to be viewed is of such magnitude as to appear under an angle of several degrees on each side of the centre, the requisite distinctness cannot be given to the whole surface by a common lens, in consequence of the confusion occasioned by oblique incidence of the lateral rays, excepting by means of a very small aperture and proportional diminution of light. In order to remedy this inconvenience, I conceived that the perforated metal, which limited the aperture of the lens, might be placed with advantage in its centre; and, accordingly, I procured two plano-convex lenses ground to the same radius, and applying their plane surfaces on opposite sides of the same aperture in a thin piece of metal, I produced the desired effect, having virtually a double convex lens so contrived, that the passage of oblique pencils was at right angles with its surface as well as the central pencil. With a lens so constructed, the perforation that seemed to give the most perfect distinctness was about *one-fifth* part of the focal length in diameter; and when such an aperture is well centered, the visible field is at least as much as twenty degrees in diameter. It is here that a portion of light is lost, by doubling the number of surfaces; but this is more than compensated by the greater aperture which, under these circumstances, is compatible with distinct vision."

It is very remarkable that Dr. Wollaston did not think of

\* *Phil. Trans.*, 1697.

† The Title of Dr. Paris's two charming volumes.

‡ *Id. Id.*, 1812, p. 375.

cementing together the two lenses of his combination, including the perforation, and thus preventing the loss of light which he mentions. It is still more strange that he did not separate his lenses when they were less than a hemisphere, as they seem always to have been, by a cubical piece of plate glass, whose width was equal to the perforation which he wished; and stranger still, that he did not think of making the periscopic sphere or grooved lens of one piece of glass, as we have already described.

2. *Periscopic Achromatic Spheres*.—Sir David Brewster has described a periscopic achromatic doublet. The two double convex lenses have their external surfaces of the same convexity, so as to form part of a sphere. The space between them is filled up with a fluid of a different refractive and dispersive power, which will, of course, be a concave lens; doubly concave if the two inner surfaces of the convex lenses are convex, and plano-concave if one of these surfaces is plain. The author of this contrivance proposed to place a concave speculum of silver behind the first lens to throw light upon the object, the aperture in the speculum serving the purpose of a perforator, for limiting the transmitted rays; but such an addition is quite unnecessary, as one of the objects contemplated by it, namely, the central limitation of the aperture, may be better effected, by placing an *opaque* concave lens of wood or metal between the lenses, and filling the central aperture in it with the dispersive fluid. Mr. Coddington considers the achromatic sphere as an “improvement upon it, (the grooved sphere,) and for a single pencil undoubtedly so, and it is plain (he adds) that the advantage of having all points of the field equally distinct \* is lost.”† This loss, however, is infinitesimal, and is compensated by an enormous gain of distinctness.

3. *Doublet of no Aberration*.—This doublet, proposed by Sir John Herschel, consists of a double convex lens in contact with a meniscus, the deepest side of the convex lens being placed next the eye, and the concavity of the meniscus next the object, when

\* All points of the field are not equally distinct, unless the form of the object is circular and concentric with the sphere, and even then only when the perforation is infinitely small.

† *Treatise on the Eye and on Optical Instruments*, 1830, p. 54, note. In the note preceding this, Mr. Coddington says that he has tried the grooved sphere described in p. 17, with the most complete success, and that Mr. Carey “was preparing some glasses on this principle, which are to be fitted up with convenient stands and apparatus for botanical or other observations.” The reader will see from this note how Mr. Carey, ignorant of what had been done nine years before, gave the *grooved sphere* the false name of the *Coddington Lens*; and he will also see from the note in Mr. Coddington’s book, on the value of the achromatic sphere, that he knew of its having been invented in 1840, and could not possibly have led Mr. Carey to suppose that he was the inventor of the grooved lens described and drawn on the very same page with the achromatic sphere.

the doublet is used as a microscope, and the reverse when used as a burning-glass. In the following table we have the radii and focal length of two lenses as computed by Sir John:—

		No. I.		No. II.
<i>Focal length</i> of the convex lens,	+	10·000	+	10·000
Radius of its first surface,	. +	5·833	+	5·833
Radius of its second surface,	. —	35·000	—	35·000
<i>Focal length</i> of the <i>Meniscus</i> ,	. +	17·829	+	5·497
Radius of its first surface,	. +	3·688	+	2·954
Radius of its second surface,	. +	6·291	+	8·128
<i>Focal length</i> of the <i>combined lenses</i> ,	+	6·407	+	3·474

In these doublets the central aberration is corrected, which is a valuable property in the examination of minute objects, or when we use the doublet as an eye-piece, to “scrutinize the appearance of a planet, a lunar mountain, the nucleus of a comet, or a close-double star, whose extent of field is of less consequence than perfect distinctness in the central point.”\*

Mr. Pritchard has found these doublets to answer well as the object-glasses of compound microscopes, though their angle aperture is small.†

4. *Herschel's Plano-Convex Doublet*.—Sir John Herschel has proposed another doublet of simpler construction, and in which the spherical aberration is greatly diminished. It consists of two convex lenses of equal focal lengths, the convex sides being placed in contact, and the eye and object opposite the plane sides. In this combination, the spherical aberration is less than *two-thirds* of that of a single lens of the best form. When the doublet is made of garnet, the aberration is upwards of *twelve* times less than that of the best single lens.

5. *Wollaston's Doublet*.—A very great improvement in microscopes was made by Dr. Wollaston, by combining two plano-convex lenses whose focal lengths are as *three to one*, and whose plane sides, both of which are towards the object, are distant from each other from  $1\frac{1}{10}$ ths to  $1\frac{1}{10}$ ths of the focal length of the smallest. If the focal length of the smallest is only 1·20th of an inch, the distance of the lenses would be only about 1·30th of an inch, so that this form of the doublet is nearly as compact as if the lenses were in contact. Dr. Wollaston supposed that the chromatic and spherical aberrations would be corrected by this combination; but Mr. Coddington has shewn that such a correction is impossible; and Mr. Pritchard has found that, in practice, the maximum distinctness is not obtained when the lenses are placed at the distances given

\* See *Phil. Trans.*, p. 246.

† *Microscopic Cabinet*, p. 163.

by Dr. Wollaston's rule. The distance which appeared to him to be essential to obtain the best effect, was *the difference of the focal length of the two lenses, making a proper allowance for their thickness*, the ratio of the focal lengths being varied at pleasure. The difference, however, must be greater than the thickness of the anterior lens; and the greater this difference is, the greater will be the space left in front.\*

Dr. Wollaston informs us, "that with this microscopic doublet he has seen the finest striæ and serratures on the scales of the *lepisma* and *podura*, and the scales in a gnat's wing, with a degree of delicate perspicuity which I have in vain sought in any other microscope with which I am acquainted."

This opinion of the excellence of these instruments is amply confirmed by Mr. Pritchard, who mentions "the delicacy and beauty with which these doublets exhibit the structure of tissues." Mr. Pritchard "has found globules to perform very well, provided they are free from air-bubbles, which is rarely the case," and he has combined in these doublets lenses of sapphire and garnet with glass. One of these, consisting of a sapphire lens *one-sixtieth* of an inch focus, and a glass lens *one-tenth* of an inch, exhibited the lines on the *podura* and *brassica* as well as in any compound microscope he had seen.

Mr. Pritchard remarked, that he has not observed any advantage when both lenses are gems. This result must have arisen from special causes; for lenses of any gem, that are superior to glass ones when acting singly, must, if suitably combined, be superior also when united. In proof of this, the writer of this Article got one executed by Mr. Blackie with *Elio* garnets, the performance of which is remarkable. The radius of the smallest lens near the object is *one-seventieth* of an inch, and that of the other *one-twentieth*.

6. *Microscopic Triplets*.—Mr. Pritchard has constructed triplet microscopes upon the same principle as the doublets, the third or posterior lens having the longest focal length of the three. When the adjustment and centering are perfect, they accurately exhibit the most difficult line objects. Having long used one of Mr. Pritchard's triplets, we can confirm this account of its excellence. Mr. Blackie executed for us a triplet, the centre lens of which is garnet, the posterior one of quartz, and the other of plate-glass.

A triplet microscope, said to be excellent, was constructed by Mr. J. Holland in 1832 or earlier, and rewarded by the Society of Arts. It consisted of three plano-convex lenses, having three plane sides towards the object. The lens next the object, 1-25th

---

\* *Microscopic Cabinet*, pp. 164, 165.

of an inch in focal length, touched the second, 1-15th of an inch. A diaphragm is then placed above this lens, and above the diaphragm at the distance of the sixth or seventh of an inch is placed the third lens, 1-5th of an inch in focus. "The beautiful effect," says Mr. Holland, "of this combination, principally depends upon the due distance between the middle and upper lens, and on the aperture in the diaphragm." "The triplet, to be efficient, should be equivalent in power to a single lens, 1-25th of an inch focus."\* Triplets have been successfully used by Mr. Brooke as the eye-piece of a compound microscope.

It deserves to be noticed that the human eye is a microscope with four lenses—two convex lenses, and two concave meniscuses, namely, the cornea, the action of whose front surface is equivalent to a convex lens, the aqueous humour, which is a meniscus convex in front, but more concave behind, the crystalline lens, and the vitreous humour.

7. *Fluid Doublets and Triplets.*—Having succeeded in making fluid doublets, in which the two lenses formed a sphere with a contraction in the middle like the grooved sphere, Sir David Brewster made triplets also in which all the lenses were fluids, and others in which one of them was a solid. The success of these trials depends entirely upon the accuracy with which, by the method already referred to, we make the axes of the lenses coincident. By depositing the fluid lenses upon plane, convex, and concave surfaces of glass or precious stones, we can vary at pleasure their focal length, and the relative curvatures of their surfaces.

8. *Achromatic Doublets and Triplets.*—Owing to the small size of the lenses in doublets and triplets, and the short distance between them, fluids, forming concave or convex lenses of any shape, can be maintained between the solid lenses merely by capillary attraction, and hence it becomes easy to achromatize doublets and triplets, the fluid lenses requiring no centering when the solid ones are properly centered. The lens next the object may be immersed in water or any other fluid, an arrangement which, as we shall presently see, affords valuable results.

We have called the attention of our readers to microscopic doublets and triplets, and to those made from diamonds and other gems, because, for reasons which will be afterwards explained, we believe that they will one day be in universal use.

III. THE COMPOUND MICROSCOPE.—We have already stated that the first compound microscopes consisted of a convex

---

\* See *Transactions of the Society of Arts* for 1832, vol. xlix. p. 120. This microscope is only a *Doublet*, with one of the glasses double.

lens for an object-glass, and a concave one for an eye-glass. In 1646, Fontana used *two* convex lenses, the one next the eye magnifying the enlarged image of the object formed by the other, called the object-glass. Another lens of a greater diameter was afterwards placed before the eye-glass to enlarge the field of view. For nearly a century and a half the compound microscope remained stationary, and though achromatic telescopes were in universal use, no attempt was made to make the microscope achromatic. In 1776, indeed, Euler proposed to employ achromatic object-glasses in the compound microscope, but it seems to have excited no notice, and so late as 1821, M. Biot considered their introduction as out of the question, from the impracticability of achromatizing lenses as small as those which the microscope requires. The opticians, however, were wiser than the philosopher, and two years had hardly elapsed after this discouraging prediction, before M. Selligues in France, and Dr. Goring in England, had actually had small achromatic object-glasses constructed, the one by M. Chevalier, a distinguished optician in Paris, and the other by Mr. Tulley in London.

1. *Achromatic Compound Microscopes.*—The first achromatic microscope was contrived by M. Selligues, and constructed by M. Chevalier. M. Selligues contrived a combination of four achromatic lenses, (about an inch and a half in focal length,) each consisting of a plano-concave of flint, and a double convex of crown or plate-glass cemented together; but having placed the convex sides of the combination towards the object, the aberration was enormous. M. Chevalier, however, observed the mistake, turned the concave lens to the object, and, in 1825, produced a very superior instrument. The construction of achromatic object-glasses was improved by Fraunhofer, Amici, Utzschneider, and others; but it is to our countryman, Mr. Lister,\* who investigated the subject experimentally, that we owe the most important improvements in achromatic microscopes—improvements founded on the following proposition:—

“That, in general, an achromatic object-glass of which the inner surfaces are in contact, or nearly so, will have on one side of it two foci in its axis; for the rays proceeding from which the spherical aberration will be *truly corrected* at a moderate aperture; that for the space between these two points its spherical aberration will be *over corrected*, and beyond them, either way, under corrected.”

Following this principle, Mr. Andrew Ross executed achromatic microscopes of great power and beauty. Mr. Powell fol-

\* *Phil. Trans.*, 1829.

lowed in the same career; and Messrs. Smith and Beck, the latter a nephew of Mr. Lister, have rivalled their distinguished predecessors. Mr. Ross is now in partnership with his son, and Mr. Powell with his brother-in-law, Mr. Lealand. The microscopes made by these different firms have surpassed those of all other opticians both in England and abroad; and though it would be hazardous on any other ground than experimental trials to give the palm to any of these gentlemen, we believe it will not give offence to any of them if we place Mr. Andrew Ross at the head of British opticians, and give him also the credit of having produced object-glasses with a greater angular aperture and magnifying power than any of his rivals.

In thus giving the palm to British opticians in the construction of the microscope, we must, at the same time, do justice to foreign genius. The very great merits of M. Chevalier are well known and highly appreciated in England, and the instruments of M. Nachet, MM. Oberhauser, and M. Pillischer,\* have obtained for them a high reputation. In America, Mr. Spencer is said to have produced microscopes rivalling those of Europe, and Mr. Wenham, who is not a professional optician, has made important improvements on the microscope. There is one foreigner, however, to whom special honour is due. In 1855, when the Jury on Microscopes at the Paris Exposition were comparing the rival instruments, Professor Amici of Modena, already distinguished by his early efforts in making achromatic lenses, and in the improvement of the reflecting microscope, brought a compound achromatic microscope, comparatively of small dimensions, which exhibited certain striæ in test objects better than any of the instruments under examination. This superiority was produced by the introduction of water between the object and the object-glass.

In an article without diagrams, it would be impossible to give the reader any idea of the beautiful and ingenious arrangements, both for research and instruction, which distinguish the achromatic microscopes of the artists we have mentioned. The optical combinations are, generally speaking, the same in all. It is in the construction of the lenses, and in their angles of aperture, that the merits of the workman lie. We shall therefore give in the following tables the information which our readers might expect in an article of this kind.

Mr. Ross was prevented from exhibiting his microscopes in Paris last year, but the following are the dimensions of those he now makes for sale. He had gained the Great Council Medal,

\* M. Pillischer, a Hungarian by birth, is now a resident in London.

as the most successful competitor in 1851, and had, therefore, no particular motive for competing a second time.

*Mr. Ross's Object-glasses in 1855.*

Object-glasses	Angles of Aperture.	Magnifying Powers with four Eye pieces				Prices
		A	B	C	D	
2 inches	12 degrees.	20	30	10	60	£3 0 0
1 "	15 "	60	80	100	120	2 0 0
1 "	22 "	60	80	100	120	3 10 0
0 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	65 "	100	130	160	220	5 5 0
0 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	85 "	220	350	500	620	5 5 0
0 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	125 "	220	350	500	620	7 10 0
0 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	135 "	320	510	700	910	10 0 0
0 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	150 "	400	670	960	1,200	11 0 0
0 $\frac{1}{4}$ "	150 "	400	670	900	1,200	12 0 0
0 $\frac{1}{2}$ "	170 "	650	900	1,250	2,000	18 0 0

Messrs. Smith and Beck received also a Council Medal in 1851, and they carried off the microscopic prize in Paris in 1855, a medal of the First Class being adjudged to them. Besides the instrument which gained the prize, they sent what they call their "educational microscope," an instrument of great value. With object-glasses of one inch, and a quarter of an inch, and angles of aperture of 22° and 75°, its price packed in a case is only £10, and the additional apparatus, including one Lieberkhun reflector, a Wenham's parabolic reflector, a Wollaston's camera-lucida for drawing, a polarizing apparatus complete, with Nicol's prisms and Selenite plate, amounts only to £5 additional. No fewer than 100 of these microscopes were sold in eight months since the middle of 1855, and two-thirds of the number were purchased with the additional apparatus. The following table shews the focal lengths and angles of aperture of the object-glass of their microscopes.

*Messrs. Smith and Beck's Object-glasses in 1855.*

Focal Lengths.	Angles of Aperture.
1 $\frac{1}{2}$ Inches,	13°
0 $\frac{2}{3}$ "	27°
0 $\frac{4}{10}$ "	90°
0 $\frac{1}{6}$ "	110°
0 $\frac{1}{8}$ "	120°

M. Nachet, who gained a Prize Medal in London in 1851,

and whose microscopes were in that competition superior to those of all foreign artists, produced instruments at Paris which gained a medal of the First Class, and were much admired by the jury. The following is a list of the focal lengths and prices of his object-glasses.

*M. Nachet's Object-glasses in 1855.*

Focal Lengths.	Angles of Aperture.	Prices.
$\frac{1}{4}$ of an Inch,	75°	£2 10 0
$\frac{1}{6}$ "	90°	2 10 0
$\frac{1}{8}$ "	95°	3 3 0
$\frac{1}{10}$ "	110°	4 4 0
$\frac{1}{14}$ "	125°	5 5 0
$\frac{1}{16}$ "	165°	7 7 0

With these two last object-glasses, M. Nachet has stated to us that there is no test-object too difficult to be resolved when it is plunged in Canada balsam.

M. Pillischer, of Bond Street, received from the Paris Jury a medal of the Second Class for his microscope with an excellent object-glass of half-an-inch focus. His "Students' Microscopes" were remarkable for their cheapness and excellence. The following table contains the focal lengths and prices of his object-glasses.

*M. Pillischer's Object-glasses in 1855.*

Focal Lengths.	Angles of Aperture.	Prices.
2 Inches,	14°	£2 2 0
1     "	26°	2 2 0
$0\frac{1}{2}$ "	60°	4 0 0
$0\frac{1}{4}$ "	90°	5 0 0
$0\frac{1}{2}$ "	109°	5 0 0

In all the microscopes, whether simple or compound, which we have now described, a certain space, occupied by air, intervened between the object and the object-glass, and the objects to be viewed, were at one time either enclosed between two thin plates of mica, or submitted to the instrument in their natural state. At the commencement of the present century, no attempt had been made to fit up the microscope as an instrument of discovery, and to accommodate it to that particular kind of preparation which is required for the preservation and scrutiny of minute objects. So early as 1812,\* Sir David Brewster immersed both the ob-

\* *Treatise on New Philosophical Instruments*, book v. chap. ii. pp. 401-410. Edin. 1813.

ject-glass of his compound microscope, and the objects which he examined, in water and other fluids; and in the same year, long before achromatic microscopes had been constructed, he rendered his object-glass achromatic by means of the concave fluid lens, which was then placed in contact with it. Such a method of constructing microscopes for ordinary use, was not likely, from its very nature, to be followed by the professional optician, but it might have been expected that physiologists and others would have availed themselves of it in their researches. When the achromatic microscope first came into general use, the application of a fluid intermedium to improve the instrument, or to render achromatic any number of lenses in the object-glass, was pointed out by its inventor;\* but no optician, either theoretical or practical, had made use of fluids but Professor Amici of Modena, and that, too, with such success that the microscope which he thus constructed surpassed, as we have already stated, the finest microscopes of Smith and Beck, Nacet, Oberhauser, Chevalier and Pillscher, that were examined at the Parisian competition. The principle is equally applicable to single lenses, doublets, triplets, and the solar microscope; and we have no doubt that the time is approaching when *aplanatic microscopes* will be generally introduced analogous to the *aplanatic telescopes* of Dr. Blair, in which spherical aberration, and the aberration produced both by the primary and secondary spectra, are corrected.

2. *Compound Reflecting Microscope*.—On the 6th February 1672, Sir Isaac Newton communicated to the Royal Society his “design of a microscope by reflexion.” It consisted of a concave spherical speculum of metal, and an eye-glass which magnified the reflected image of any object placed between them in the conjugate focus of the speculum.† This simple contrivance has been greatly improved in modern times by Professor Amici, Professor Potter, and Dr. Goring, who have been able to give an ellipsoidal form to the speculum, the object being placed in one of its foci, and the image formed in the other.‡ Dr. Smith of Cambridge,§ and others,|| have invented and described reflecting microscopes of a different kind. These instruments, which are ill adapted either for research or instruction, however, have never come into general use, and have been superseded by the achromatic microscope.

\* *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. *Microscope*, 7th edit, vol. xv. pp. 40, 41.

† Brewster's *Memoirs of Sir Isaac Newton*, vol. i. p. 242.

‡ See *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. *Microscope*, vol. xv. p. 40; *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, Jan. 1822, No. xi. p. 61; and Goring and Pritchard's *Micrographia*, p. 23.

§ *Complete System of Opticks*, vol. ii.

|| *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xv. pp. 43, 44.

3. *Binocular Microscope*.—After the construction of the binocular telescope, the binocular microscope could hardly be called an invention, as it is nothing more than a microscope applied to each eye. About 1670, Cherubin constructed one of these instruments, but it excited no notice. In 1851, Professor Riddell, of the University of New Orleans, contrived a binocular microscope of great ingenuity, with the view “of rendering both eyes serviceable in microscopic observations.”

“Behind the objective,” he says, “and as near thereto as possible, the light is equally divided and bent at right angles, and made to travel in opposite directions, by means of two rectangular prisms, which are in contact by their edges somewhat ground away; the reflected rays are received, at a proper distance for binocular vision, upon two other rectangular prisms, and again bent at right angles, being thus either completely inverted for an inverted microscope, or restored to their first direction for the direct microscope.” “With these instruments,” the author adds, “the microscopic dissecting-knife can be exactly guided. In looking at microscopic animal tissues, the single eye may perhaps behold a confused, amorphous, or nebulous mass, which the pair of eyes instantly shapes into delicate superimposed membranes, with intervening spaces, the thickness of which can be correctly estimated. Blood corpuscles, usually seen as flat discs, loom out as oblate spheroids. In brief, the whole microscopic world, as thus displayed, acquires a tenfold greater interest in every phase, exhibiting in a new light beauty and symmetry indescribable.” With this instrument he obtained dissimilar drawings of solid objects, by means of the camera lucida; and by uniting them in the stereoscope, he brought them out in their natural relief.\* An improved binocular microscope has been constructed by M. Nachet. It is the same as his double microscope, with the tubes placed vertically and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches distant.

4. *The Multocular Microscope*.—In order to fit up the microscope for the purposes of instruction, but more especially for anatomical demonstration, so that two or three persons may see at the same time the same phenomenon or structure, or the result of microscopical dissections, M. Nachet has constructed two microscopes—a double and a single one. Through the first, one person can observe the progress and result of a dissection performed by another person, and through the second, two persons can enjoy this advantage.

In the microscope for two persons, a prism, whose section is an equilateral triangle, is placed above the object-glass, so that

\* A Microscope Stereoscope is described in Sir David Brewster's *Treatise on the Stereoscope*, newly published, p. 129.

the two halves of the pencil formed by the rays from the object-glass entering the lower face of the prism perpendicularly, may be reflected in opposite directions from the other faces of the prism, at an angle of  $45^\circ$ , and thus enter the two separate tubes, in each of which they form an image of the object. In a certain sense these images are erect, but in order that they may be seen in their natural position, in which case alone the anatomist can use his scalpel, a prism is placed in each tube, between the first equilateral prism and the eye-piece, so that their planes of reflection may be perpendicular to those of the other prisms. The images are thus made erect, and the demonstrator can proceed with his work without difficulty. When the two parties have eyes of different focal lengths, the adjustment is produced by a motion of the eye-piece.

IV. THE POLARIZING MICROSCOPE. — There are certain structures in minerals, in plants, and in the tissues and various parts of animals that are *wholly invisible* in the microscope. In the cornea and crystalline lenses of animals,—in composite minerals,—in simple minerals, such as amethyst, analcime, and apophyllite,—in a great variety of crystals to which the name of *circular* has been given, and in plants, such as the equisetaceous and gramineous, there are beautiful organizations, arising from difference of density, difference of structure, and the dissemination of crystallized matter, to which the human eye, however assisted by the best microscopes, is absolutely blind, when viewed in common light.

Common light, as it comes from the sun, and from artificial flames, consists of, or may be divided into, two kinds of light, as electricity may be divided into vitreous and resinous, or magnetism into north polar and south polar. Thus divided, common light is said to be *polarized*, and the two portions exhibit different properties when reflected from or transmitted through bodies. If we suppose a cylindrical beam of common light to be composed of different parts, like a number of shillings arranged in a cylindrical row, with the Queen's heads lying in all directions, then, if one-half of the shillings separated from the other half have all the Queen's heads standing upright, and if the other half have all the Queen's heads lying horizontally, we shall have an idea of polarized light. Now the separation of common into polarized light may be effected by making light pass through several plates of glass at an angle of about  $55^\circ$ , all the reflected light will be polarized like the cylinder of shillings with the Queen's heads upright, and the transmitted light (when the plates are sufficiently numerous) like the cylinder with the heads lying horizontal. Light similarly reflected from a single polished surface of transparent or black bodies not metallic, will also be polarized.

Common light may also be divided into two polarized pencils, by *passing through* certain crystals, such as Iceland spar and quartz. Each pencil is polarized oppositely, and when a rhomb of Iceland spar is cut into two parts, and these parts combined so that one of the pencils is hindered from reaching the eye, it constitutes a *Nicol's prism*, now used in the polarizing microscope. In certain crystals, such as tourmaline and herapathite, (the sulphate of iodo-quinine,) one of the pencils is absorbed, and plates of these substances therefore are often used in microscopes as polarizers.

When polarized light has passed through any transparent body, a change is produced upon it by the action of all those bodies that have an invisible structure, and this change is made visible by looking through another polarizer, placed transversely to the first polarizer, which is called the analyzer. The structure of the microscopic object is thus displayed in different colours, or in different shades of white light, the colour, or the degree of light depending on the thickness of the different parts of the object. The forms thus disclosed to the eye are at once splendid and beautiful, never failing to surprise even observers who have been long accustomed to the sight.

The polarizing microscope, both simple and compound, was first constructed and used by Sir David Brewster in his experiments in 1815 on diamond and rock salt, and afterwards in those on amethyst, analcime, apophyllite, the equisetum hiemale, &c., the coloured drawings having been made for him by Mr. Lizars, through the polarizing microscope. The polarizers and analyzers which he used were bundles of glass plates, either reflecting or transmitting light, tourmalines, or small rhombs, or achromatized prisms of calcareous spar. After Mr. William Nicol had invented the prism which goes by his name, Mr. Talbot used it in the compound microscope, in which he made his beautiful experiments on circular crystals.\*

1. *Single Polarizing Microscope*.—This microscope is a single lens, or a doublet with a piece of tourmaline the size of the pupil, as the analyzer, placed between it and the eye. The object is then examined in polarized light, produced by reflexion or otherwise. The magnifier and analyzer may be united in a lens of tourmaline.

2. *Compound Polarizing Microscope*.—When Mr. Talbot used the polarizing microscope, he placed one Nicol's prism beneath the object, and the other close to the eye. Sir David Brewster placed the analyzing Nicol's prism immediately behind the object-glass, an improvement now generally adopted, and in place of a Nicol's prism beneath the object, he uses a small rhomb of spar, presenting only one of its pencils to the object.\*

---

\* See *Treatise on the Microscope*, pp. 95-101.

Along with the polarizing apparatus, there is generally sent a plate of selenite, which is a film of sulphate of lime or gypsum, of such a thickness as to polarize a blue of the second order. This plate was first used by Sir David Brewster to shew weak polarized tints; and has been employed since by Mr. Talbot and others, merely to show off the colours of polarizing structures, when they are sufficiently strong, by displaying them on a blue ground. When thus exhibited, all the negative tints, as we may call them, are diminished, and all the positive ones increased; and the effect of the plate is to mask the true character of the phenomenon. Drawings of polarizing structures thus coloured are therefore of no value; and for this reason we have been surprised to see the tints of oxaluret of ammonia exhibited on a blue ground by Messrs. Griffith and Henfrey.

#### \* VI. ON THE ILLUMINATION OF MICROSCOPIC OBJECTS.—

Great attention has been for some time paid to the illumination of objects presented to the microscope. Dr. Wollaston\* proposed a plan approximating, though slightly, to the correct method, which was first proposed, in 1831, by Sir David Brewster. In this method, a distinct picture of the source of light must be thrown upon the object, so that its rays should radiate from the object as if it were self-luminous. If this is not the case, diffraction fringes are produced. Hence, the author of this method says, *that the apparatus for illumination should be as perfect as the magnifying apparatus.* The object might often be placed on the plane side of minute lenses, which would illuminate only a very small part of the field, no more light being required than what falls upon the part of the object to be examined.†

Sir Isaac Newton suggested it as an improvement on the refracting microscope, “to illuminate the object in a darkened room with light of any convenient colour, not too much compounded; for, by that means, the microscope will with distinctness bear a deeper charge and larger apparatus.”‡ This idea has been realized by the monochromatic lamp of Sir David Brewster, by the use of which Dr. Goring found all the rings of colours to disappear, which were the result of chromatic aberration, and which were so mixed up with the effects of spherical aberration as to hide the concentric annuli which it produced in a plano-convex lens acting as the object-glass of a compound microscope, with an achromatic Huygenian eye-piece.§

\* *Phil. Trans.* 1829.

† See *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, New Series, No. xi. p. 83 and p. 64; and *Treatise on the Microscope*, p. 146.

‡ *Memoirs of Sir Isaac Newton*, vol. i. p. 243.

§ *Microscopic Cabinet*, p. 198, or *Microscopic Illustrations*, pp. 271, 272.

A valuable method of illuminating transparent objects, called the "Black-ground illumination," has been introduced by the Rev. Mr. Reade. "It consists in illuminating the object by a very strong light, placed at such an obliquity to the axis of the microscope, that none of the rays can enter it except those that impinge directly upon the object."\*

VI. PREPARATION OF MICROSCOPIC OBJECTS.—We have already touched upon this subject in a former section, and we must content ourselves to refer the reader to an account of the methods used by Swammerdam† and Cuvier,‡ and to the instructions published by Mr. Pritchard,§ Dr. Carpenter, and Dr. Griffith and Mr. Hensley.

VII. DELINEATION OF THE MAGNIFIED IMAGES OF OBJECTS.—A skilful draughtsman finds no difficulty in drawing objects seen through the microscope, but naturalists and others require some assistance in recording their discoveries. Mr. Bauer, a most accomplished artist, has published|| the methods which he has so successfully employed, and Mr. Cornelius Varley, in his admirable treatise on "Optical Drawing Instruments," has constructed a graphic microscope, in which the drawings are executed by the camera lucida. The photographic art, however, has thrown all these methods into the shade, and we are now able to delineate, by the action of light, all the phenomena seen by the microscope. This is done simply by removing the eye-piece, receiving the magnified image upon paper or collodion prepared for the purpose, and fixing it in all its details upon the sensitive material.¶

VIII. REVELATIONS OF THE MICROSCOPE.—It would be a vain attempt were we to try to convey to our readers any idea of the great discoveries which have been made by the microscope, or of the important purposes to which it has been applied. Second only to the telescope, though in many respects superior to it, the microscope transcends all other instruments in the scientific value as well as in the social interest of its results. While the human eye, the telescope and microscope combined, enables us to enjoy and examine the scenery around us, to study the forms of life with which we are more immediately connected, it fails to transport us into the depths of space, to throw into relief the planets and the stars, and to indicate the forms and arrangements in the

\* Pritchard and Goring's *Micrographia*, pp. 73, 227; and *Illustrations*, p. 133.

† Boerhaave's *Life of Swammerdam*, and Pritchard's *Illustrations*, p. 244.

‡ Pritchard's *Micrographia*, p. 219.

§ *Id.*, *Cabinet*, chap. xx.

|| *Id.*, *Micrographia*, pp. 221-226.

¶ See Griffith and Hensley's *Micrographic Dictionary*, *Introd.*, p. xxxv.

worlds of life and motion which distance diminishes and conceals. To these mysterious abodes, so long unrevealed, the telescope has at last conveyed us. It has shewn us those worlds and systems, of which our own earth and our own system are the types; but it fails to enlighten us respecting the nature and constitution of the celestial bodies, and the forms of life for which they were created.

In its downward scrutiny, as well as in its upward aspirations, the human eye has equally failed. In the general view which it commands of animal, vegetable, and mineral structures, it cannot reach those delicate organizations on which life depends, or those structures of inorganic matter from which its origin and composition can be derived. Into these mysterious regions, where the philosopher has been groping his way, the microscope now conducts him. The dark abodes of unseen life are lighted up for his contemplation,—organizations of transcendent beauty appeal to his wonder,—new aspects of life, new forms of being, new laws of reproduction, new functions in exercise, reward the genius of the theoretical and practical optician, and the skill and toil of the naturalist. With wonders like these all nature is pregnant: the earth, the ocean, and the air—times past and times present, now surrender their secrets to the microscope.

The invisible life of pre-Adamite ages has been embalmed in the rocks and stones buried deep in the bowels of the earth. Its siliceous and calcareous defences reappear in the flints, the limestones, the trachytes, the chalks, the opals, the tripolis, the polischiefers, the guanos, the soils, and the muds of every region of the globe. It is ejected from volcanoes in the arctic and in the torrid zones,—it is breathed in the sirocco,—it falls silently on the deck of the ship in the Atlantic and in the Pacific Oceans, and it is embosomed even in the stony meteors that fall from the heavens.

The invisible life of modern times, as disclosed by the microscope, has been the subject of careful study by the naturalist and the physiologist. All space—within us, and without us, and around us—swarms with its countless millions; and on whatever speck or atom of life man rests his eye, he learns the instructive lesson, that he is not the only creature that is fearfully and wonderfully made. Descriptions and drawings of these singular structures will be found in the works of Ehrenberg, Pritchard, Quekett, Carpenter, and Griffith and Hentfrey, and the general as well as the scientific reader will gather wisdom and instruction from their valuable pages.

But however interesting is the study of microscopic life, and however beautiful its forms and startling its functions, the microscope claims a higher value in having given birth to the truly useful science of *Histology*, which describes the structure of

animal and vegetable tissues in reference to their origin and development. The elementary tissues of animal and vegetable life have been eagerly studied both in their structure and functions, and physiologists have been thus led to the remarkable conclusion, that each integral portion of the animal or plant possesses an independent life of its own, performing a series of actions peculiar to itself, "and," as Dr. Carpenter expresses it, "that the life of the body, as a whole, (like a symphony performed by a full orchestra,) consists in the harmonious combination of its separate instrumental acts,—the circulation of the blood instead of *making the tissues*, simply affording the supply of prepared nutriment at the expense of which they *evolve themselves* from germs previously existing."\* A single primordial cell, therefore, is the first step in created life, and from the congeries of cells, to all appearance similar and equal, are developed those various parts of the noble casket which constitutes man, and encloses his immortal soul.

To the exigencies of social life, too, the microscope has made valuable contributions. It detects the invisible ingredients, whether precipitated in atoms or aggregated in crystals, which adulterate our food, our drink, and our medicines. It displays the lurking poison in the minute crystallizations which its solutions precipitate. It tells the murderer that the blood which stains him is that of his brother, and not of the other life which he pretends to have taken; and as a witness against the criminal, it, on one occasion, appealed to the very sand on which he trod at midnight.

Had our limits permitted, we would have endeavoured, though without diagrams it might have been difficult, to give our readers some idea of some of the marvellous structure and functions which are described and delineated by the authors we have mentioned; but we must content ourselves with a cursory notice of their works, and of the subjects of which they treat."

The work of Professor Ehrenberg is one of the most magnificent productions of the modern press, and does honour to the liberality of the King of Prussia, one of the few royal patrons of the sciences. The plates, several of which are coloured, are executed with exquisite delicacy, and in many of its forty-one folio plates, there are *several hundred* of individual specimens engraven in each. The very inspection of these plates impresses the reader with the most exalted idea of the boundless extent of animalcular life, and with the highest admiration of the talent, the toil, and the patience of the author.

The elaborate Micrographical Dictionary of Dr. Griffith and

\* *The Microscope, &c.*, p. 28.

Professor Hensfey is a most valuable contribution to natural history and physiology. Its alphabetic arrangement is, in many respects, advantageous, and will doubtless be appreciated by naturalists already familiar with the subject; but the general reader misses the systematic arrangement of other writers, and experiences some difficulty in finding the head under which any particular organ, or any remarkable function, is described. In an excellent introduction of forty pages, the authors treat, under two heads, of the "Use of the Microscope, and Examination of Microscopic Objects," and of the "General Method of determining the Structure of Microscopic Objects, from the appearances which they present under various conditions." Though inferior to those of Ehrenberg, the engravings of this work are good and numerous. Their descriptions are conveniently placed on the opposite page, and the objects themselves are given in their real colours.

The volume of Dr. Carpenter, entitled "The Microscope and its Revelations," would appear from its title to be, primarily, a treatise on the microscope, and, secondarily, a treatise on its revelations; but this is not the case, as the part on the microscope occupies only a third of the whole work.

Instead of referring, as Dr. Griffith, Professor Hensfey, and Mr. Quekett have done, to existing treatises, in which the elementary principles of optics are explained and applied to the construction of instruments, Dr. Carpenter has initiated his readers into the laws of refraction—the refraction of light by convex and concave lenses, and the more intricate topics of spherical and chromatic aberration. He has described, too, such a vast number of microscopes, and such a quantity of apparatus, as would fill an ordinary volume, and has thus given to his work an unseemly shape, and a plethoric bulk unusual in our literature.

When a physiologist gives notice of a work on the history of microscopical discovery, enriched with his own observations, the public expect nothing more, if so much, than a description of the instrument which he has used, and an account of the methods by which he prepared his objects, and arrived at his results. To do more than this, by writing a treatise on the microscope, is, however well done, a work of supererogation. A physiologist who uses a microscope, is no more fitted to write an optical treatise on it, than a natural philosopher to compose a work on the structure and functions which the microscope discloses. A watchmaker who uses a transit telescope to correct his chronometer, and the itinerant astronomer who looks to the heavens through his tube, would give a poor history of the telescope and its improvers. Opticians might contribute to it their useful and practical contingent; but we should hear little of the Galileos, the Keplers, the Eulers, the Halls, and the Dollonds, the Herschels

and the Rosses, by whose genius and labours it has been brought to its present state of perfection.

We have made these remarks not to depreciate the work of Dr. Carpenter, but to vindicate the rights of many distinguished men whose names and labours he seems to have systematically excluded. Men who, during the last quarter of a century, have devoted their time and their means to the improvement of the microscope, are never once named in Dr. Carpenter's pages, while every optician who has proposed a new combination of lenses and tubes, and every amateur who has proposed a new stage, a new indicator, a new reflector, or a new trough to hold a zoophyte, is duly immortalized. M. Chevalier of Paris, not only the earliest improver of the achromatic microscope, but the first constructor of it, and known to all Europe by his writings and improvements on the microscope, is not named in Dr. Carpenter's volume. Mr. Pritchard, too, whose name will occupy an eminent place in the history of the microscope, both as an author, an improver, and an optician, is not once named by Dr. Carpenter, nor the slightest reference made to his numerous works. His arduous and costly labours in the manufacture of diamond lenses, and lenses from other precious stones, are entirely overlooked, while inventions are ascribed to individuals which they never made, and never even claimed. We say nothing of other inventors, who can afford to be overlooked, and who may vindicate their rights in another quarter, if they do not scorn to insist upon a place in the pages of compilation.

In protesting against such historical injustice, we are not blind to the merits of that part of Dr. Carpenter's work where that injustice is perpetrated, and still less to the valuable materials which, in *fourteen*\* interesting chapters, form the second part of his volume.

At a time when everybody writes upon everything to gratify a popular taste, and when our intellectual and physical food is equally adulterated, it is time for the friends of education to invoke the co-operation of men whose powers of research are not inferior to their powers of instruction.

The *Treatise on the Microscope*, by Professor Quekett, is not liable to any of these criticisms. He has referred his readers to the best treatises on optics, and has almost never failed to give due credit to the individuals who are entitled to a place in the history of the microscope. His work is in every respect a most

---

\* The second part of the work contains *fifteen* chapters, but the fifteenth, on the mineral kingdom, polarization, and crystallized salts, is a blot upon the volume. The author does not seem to have any knowledge of what has been done on these subjects by his contemporaries.

valuable contribution to science, and it contains almost every kind of information which the microscopical physiologist can desire. It is one of the illustrated standard scientific works on which their enterprising publisher, Mr. Baillière, has spared no expense to render them worthy of the scientific public.

The *Treatise on the Microscope* by Dr. Lardner, an elegant volume, embellished with 147 engravings,\* is, like all his other popular works, distinguished by a happy combination of theoretical and practical knowledge. In his pages, M. Chevallier and Mr. Pritchard emerge from their total eclipse in Dr. Carpenter's book, and a tribute of praise is willingly conceded to all who have contributed to the improvement of the microscope. "The Museum of Science and Art," of which this treatise is a portion, has now reached its tenth volume, and is the most valuable contribution that has ever been made to the scientific instruction of every class in society.

The four treatises of Mr. Pritchard have been highly esteemed, both for their scientific and practical details. They abound in valuable and popular information on every branch of microscopical science. The inventions of himself, and those of Dr. Goring, contributed largely to the improvement of every variety of the microscope, while their writings added greatly to the literature of the subject. His magnificent volume on *Infusorial Animalcules* is a work of great beauty and interest. The author has "freely availed himself of the elaborate works of Ehrenberg, the splendid monographs of Kützing and Ralfs, as well as the valuable researches of Professors Bailey, Siebold, Dujardin, Dr. Stein, Mr. Brightwell, and others," and he has produced *twenty-four* coloured plates, executed with great delicacy, and of course much superior to the wood engravings of Dr. Carpenter, and to the plates of Dr. Griffiths and Professor Hensley. They greatly excel, too, the engraved plates in the "*Micrographic Dictionary*" of the latter, and if they are not equal to the finest of Ehrenberg's plates, they are little inferior to them. To the general reader especially, the volume will have a particular interest.

In various parts of this *Journal*, we have had occasion to call the attention of our readers to the subject of popular education, and to the importance of instructing our youth in those truths of Natural History, Natural Philosophy, and Physical Geography, which, by specimens and models and instruments, may be made intelligible to ordinary capacities. We pointed out the advantages of establishing museums in every district, and even in every

---

\* Owing to its wide circulation, this volume, elegantly done up in cloth, is sold for two shillings!

school, and there is reason to believe that these views have met with general approbation, and that the time is not distant when we may see them realized. The Commissioners of the Great Exhibition of 1851, with Prince Albert at their head, and comprising the highest names in rank, influence, and intelligence, have taken up the idea, and have stated, in their Report to Parliament, that "*the importance of establishing a general Museum of Education in this country, with the view of introducing improvements in the existing methods of instruction, and specially directing public attention to the question of National Education, has been of late generally recognised.*"\*

In the Introduction to his Work, Dr. Carpenter has treated largely and ably of the educational value and uses of the microscope, and had our limits permitted, we should have made more than one extract from his pages. After urging the importance of turning the thoughts of the young "from the pages of books to those of creation, and from the teachings of man to those of God," he remarks, that "if we attempt to give this direction to the thoughts and feelings in a merely didactic mode, it loses that spontaneousness which is one of its most valuable features. But if we place before the young a set of objects, which can scarcely fail to excite their healthful curiosity, satisfying this only so far as to leave them still inquirers, and stimulating their interest from time to time by the disclosure of such new wonders as arouse new feelings of delight, they come to look upon the pursuit as an ever fresh fountain of happiness and enjoyment, and to seek every opportunity of following it for themselves." . . . "For these reasons the microscope is not merely a most valuable adjunct in such instruction, but its assistance is essential in giving to almost every natural object its highest educational value."

The same claim may be justly made, though in a different degree, for the telescope, the barometer, and the thermometer; instruments which should be placed in every school, and which every scholar should be taught to use.

Animated with the same views, Sir David Brewster has, in his Treatise on the Stereoscope, just published, expressed similar sentiments, and has claimed for the stereoscope the rank of an educational instrument, indispensable in elementary as well as in professional education. "When the scholar," says he, "has learned to read, to write, and to count, he has attained only the tools of instruction. To acquire a general knowledge of the works of God and of man—of things common and un-

\* *Third Report of the Commissioners for the Exhibition of 1851, presented to both Houses of Parliament, p. 37. Lond. 1856.*

common—of the miracles of nature and of art, is the first step in the education of the people. Without such knowledge the humblest of our race is unfit for any place in the social scale. He may have learned to read his Bible, and he may have read it after he had learned to read;—he may have committed to memory every sentence in the decalogue:—he may have packed into the storehouse of his brain all the wisdom of Solomon, and all the Divine precepts of a greater than Solomon, while he is utterly ignorant of everything above him, around him, and within him,—ignorant of the form, the magnitude, and the motions of his terrestrial home,—ignorant of the gigantic structures which constitute the material universe,—ignorant of the fabrics which industry prepares for his use, and of the luxuries which commerce brings from the ends of the earth, and places at his door,—ignorant even of the wonderful operations of that beneficent commissariat, which is every moment, when he sleeps and dreams, elaborating the materials with which he is clothed and fed.” . . . “If the education of the people is to be attempted, either by partial or comprehensive legislation, the existing system is utterly inefficient. The teacher, however wisely chosen and well qualified, has not at his command the means of imparting knowledge. He may pour it into the ear, or extract it from the printed page, or exhibit it in caricature in the miserable embellishments of the school-book; but unless he teaches through the eye, the great instrument of knowledge, by means of truthful pictures, or instruments, or models, or by the direct exhibition of the products of nature and of art, which can be submitted to the scrutiny of the senses, no satisfactory instruction can be conveyed. Every school, indeed, should have a museum, however limited or humble. Even from within its narrow sphere, objects of natural history and antiquities might be collected, and duplicates exchanged; and we are sure that many a chimney-piece in the district would surrender a tithe of its curiosities for the public use. Were the British Museum and other overflowing collections to distribute among provincial museums the numerous duplicates which they possess, they would gradually pass into the schools, and before a quarter of a century elapsed, museums would be formed in every proper locality.”\*

We cannot close this Article without some anticipation of the *future* of the microscope. The history of the telescope, itself but in its youth, encourages us never to despair of the resources of science, or the power of invention. At various epochs the tele-

\* *The Stereoscope, &c., &c.*, chap. xiii.—Application of the Stereoscope to Educational purposes, pp. 193 and 195.

scope was supposed to have attained perfection. Newton despaired, and Euler despaired, and even Herschel descended from his gigantic tube and appealed to smaller and more manageable instruments. Dolloyd despaired of procuring glass for his new object-lenses. Guisand and Fraunhofer had reached their limit when Bontemp left them far behind; and when the wealth of nations, as well as their genius, shall be summoned to a competition in the manufacture of gigantic discs of glass, we have no doubt of a glorious result. The steam-engine has not yet been brought to work in the conic sections, but specula, truly parabolic and elliptical, and lenses truly hyperbolic, are doubtless in the list of things that are to be.

It is not for philosophers to despair of science. The artist may; and the worker with the microscope may think that his instrument has been brought to perfection: but when we recollect that one eminent philosopher predicted that a steam-ship could never navigate the Atlantic, and that another deep in optics, declared that an achromatic microscope was impossible, we anticipate with confidence the failure of all similar predictions.

Mr. Quekett and Dr. Carpenter have both recorded their opinion that the achromatic microscope has nearly attained perfection, and the former\* has distinctly expressed his despair of jewel and fluid lenses, and of executing surfaces other than spherical. Let us examine these discouraging assertions, and try to discover other principles of construction by which the microscope may reach a still higher position, and disclose to us secrets of life beyond the homogeneous fibre or the empty cell.

The first imperfection to be overcome in the microscope, inheres in the medium by which its refractions must be made, and its images formed. Glass is a heterogeneous compound, not formed of ingredients in definite proportions, and by the laws of chemical aggregation. Its mechanical condition is easily altered by heat and pressure, and the least variation in its density, whether from temporary or permanent causes, is injurious to the images which it forms. In the achromatic object-glass, with three double lenses combined—with the thickness of the glass which confines the object, and that of the two eyelenses, the rays have to pass through a considerable amount of glass, and are consequently exposed to the risk of encountering imperfections in their path. This possible defect in glass points out an obvious superiority in single microscopes, doublets, and triplets, and especially in those formed by the precious stones, through which heat passes quickly, and which are much less

\* *Practical Treatise on the Microscope*, pp. 66, 67.

affected by an equal degree of force. The same reasoning shews us the advantages to be obtained from lenses of homogeneous fluids.

Another defect in lenses of glass, to which we have already referred, is that its particles are in a state of unnatural constraint, and tend to dissolution, whereas lenses of precious stones will last for ever, and fluid lenses may be renewed every month or every year if we choose.

A combination of achromatic lenses is subject to other evils. When united, the rays are refracted by *twelve* different surfaces, and affected by the imperfections of each, as well as by any error in the centering of the six lenses,—whereas, if the flint lenses are replaced by fluids, their correct centering is insured.

In the best achromatic microscopes, the secondary colours are not corrected. Dr. Blair has proved that these colours may be extinguished, even in the telescope, by fluids of different dispersive powers, and it is obvious that this improvement is still more practicable in the microscope.

The imperfect correction of the spherical aberration, even in the best microscopes, encourages us to hope that refraction without aberration is a desideratum which mechanical genius may yet supply. At all events, it may be greatly diminished by using lenses of diamond, or other high refracting materials, whether mineral or artificial,\* in the object-glasses, or even in the eye-glasses of compound microscopes. We are told that diamonds are too expensive, and they certainly are for microscopes to be used for instruction or amusement; but if we wish to make great discoveries, to unfold the secrets yet hid in the cells of plants and animals, we must not grudge a diamond to reveal them. If Sir James South, and Mr. Cooper, and others, have given a couple of thousand pounds for a refracting telescope, and if Lord Rosse expended £15,000 on a reflecting one, why may not other philosophers open their purse, if they have one, and other noblemen sacrifice some of their household jewels, to resolve the microscopic structures of the lower world,—to unravel mysteries most interesting to man, and secrets which the Almighty must have intended that he should know?

There is another imperfection inseparable from the compound microscope, which merits our consideration. Whatever defects may exist in the material, or form, or position of its object-glasses, causing the rays to *stray*, as Sir Isaac Newton calls it, from the true path, whether producing difference of density, or uncorrected colour, or incoincident images, from spherical aberration,

\* The modern art of uniting gems artificially, discovered and practised by Ebelman, may supply materials for lenses, and it is not improbable that glass of high refractive and low dispersive power may yet be manufactured.

or bad centering, the effects are increased *in proportion to the distance of the image from the object-glass*. From this cause the length of the microscope is limited, and the only remedy for the evil is to shorten the instrument, and produce the requisite power, by achromatic eye-glasses, single, double, or triple. We shall thus be led to make the microscope shorter and shorter, till we descend to triplets, doublets, and single lenses, in which the power of straying is reduced to its minimum. Pure gems which, from their expense, we hesitated to use in the compound instrument, now come to our aid, and may be easily commanded for single lenses or doublets. Fluids, too, which may yet be obtained, with a refractive power equal, if not superior to the diamond, may, in the future, replace our gems; and if, when such instruments are in our hands, we place the objects in a fluid filling the space between them and the object-glass,—if we illuminate them with homogeneous light, and prepare the observing eye, by washing its cornea, and giving to the fluid which lubricates it a true geometrical figure, we may hope that the *future* of the microscope may transcend the *present*, and that splendid revelations yet await the philosophical observer. The time must come when vast discoveries must be the trophies of observers thoroughly acquainted with all the refinements of optical science. A profound knowledge of the phenomena of diffraction, of the aberration, dispersion, and absorption of light, and of the fallacies of vision, are absolutely necessary in an observer, when structures that are perplexing are to be resolved, and things that are invisible are to be seen. The microscope is but an instrument, and its deepest revelations are to be reached only by the inspirations of a prophet.

ART. VII.—*Memoirs of Frederick Perthes; or, Literary, Religious, and Political Life in Germany, from 1789 to 1843.* From the German of CLEMENT THEODORE PERTHES, Professor of Law in the University of Bonn. 2 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, Thomas Constable & Co. 1856.

THE German people, having in various ways been deprived of the fruits which they had, reasonably or unreasonably, expected from the overthrow of their great oppressor, Napoleon, at Waterloo, have, during the last twenty years, betaken themselves to the publication of Memoirs of various kinds, rich in the reminiscences of the great age which has just passed away. Among these, the memoirs of Arndt, Herr von Gagern, Strombeck, Varnhagen von Ense, Henry Steffens, the Baron von Stein, and others, are fresh in the recollection of all who take any interest in German matters beyond the usual amount of gossip about Goethe, Schiller, Tieck, Herder, and Immanuel Kant, which now belongs to the literary furniture of every man of education even in remote Scotland. But works of this class have hitherto been kept almost exclusively within the circle of professedly German scholars. The habitual exclusiveness of the English mind, the well-known narrowness of our political sympathies, our great ignorance of continental history in all matters where we are not expressly called on to perform a prominent part, have no doubt contributed their full share to prevent the enlargement of this circle. But part of the blame also unquestionably belongs to the extreme unwieldiness and portentous prosiness in which some German memoir-writers are apt to indulge; while, in other cases, the jealous eye of the censorship watching over the penman, seems to have deprived his composition of that bold freedom and racy vigour, without which political memoirs, especially to an English reader, lose more than half their value. Now, however, we are glad to see an attempt has been made by one of our most enterprising Scottish publishers to present to British readers one of those rich records of the public life of Germany during the last fifty years, in a shape that cannot fail to recommend the work to every intelligent Englishman. The memoirs of the famous publisher, Frederick Perthes, are not merely the biography of a most vigorous and widely sympathetic German man, living in an age unusually rich in stimulating and elevating moments, but they contain, as the title bears, a record of "the literary, religious, and political life of Germany," more truly and more comprehensively than any work that, to our knowledge, has appeared in that country

since the peace. The other memoirs that we mentioned were mainly of a political and literary interest; here, the religious element everywhere marches with an equal right alongside of the other two; and the experience of the "inner life" is unfolded with a faithfulness proportioned to the importance which it must always hold in the eyes of those who do not estimate the significance of history by the mere breadth of flaunting banners, the noise of Lancaster guns, and the pomp of many-coloured processions. We cannot, indeed, name a book so crammed with the most substantial materials for a thorough knowledge of Germany, as this life of the great Hamburgh publisher; and we cannot but regard it as a striking fact of more than accidental coincidence, that the most rich record of the life of the most book-making people in the world for these "paper times," (as Perthes himself used to phrase it,) should have been made by a bookseller.

The subject of the present memoir was born at Rudolstadt, in Thuringia, in the year 1772. At the age of fifteen, he was transferred from his native green hills, and bickering mountain streams, to the narrow streets and the dark counting-houses of Leipzig; and there served his apprenticeship to the book-trade under a bibliopolic gentleman named Böhlme. Like other young apprentices in that disciplinarian age, he learned, of course, not only to handle his tools, but to endure hardness of all kinds; and shewed the stuff of which he was made by falling desperately in love with his master's daughter, and then, when he found that matters were anything but clear in that quarter, "sitting up half the night, and seeking to allay the storm in his bosom by the arduous study of Kant's *Philosophy*, and Cicero's *de Officiis*." In the year 1793, he was transferred to the first scene of his future labours, Hamburgh. Here he acted at first as an assistant to one Hoffmann, a bookseller, till, in the year 1796, he was in a condition to establish a business of his own; and this he did, not merely for the purpose of making money, and achieving an independence, but with a deep feeling of the important part which a bookseller of the present day may perform in the intellectual and moral elevation of the community to which he belonged. He had observed that "where a bookseller possessed an educated taste, works of a high class were in demand; and that where, on the other hand, the bookseller was a man of low taste and immoral character, a licentious and worthless literature had a wide circulation." That this must be the case in every country, to a certain extent, seems plain; but in Germany, where the public mind is not so prepossessed by party interests and occupations, the sphere of an active bookseller must be greatly more extended. With such a high-toned ideal did

Perthes commence his bookselling business in Hamburg; and his whole career is a most instructive proof of how a human life, commenced with a noble conception, and followed out with a heroic enterprise and with an invincible perseverance, can never remain barren of notable results. Men, generally, do not achieve great things, simply because they have never greatly willed to achieve them. Perthes soon found out what Nature had meant him for; and was determined to give himself fair play, and to be and to do nothing by halves. "I am more than ever persuaded," says he, "that my destiny is an active masculine career; that I am a man born to turn my own wheel, and that of others with energy." Never did physician, with stethoscope in hand, make a more correct diagnosis of his patient's case, than Perthes, at the age of twenty-six, here makes of his own character and career. Many people in the world must be content to turn their own wheel, and that in a very intermittent and lame sort of a way sometimes; others endeavour chiefly to turn the wheels of others; but this very delicate task being undertaken often without sufficient knowledge of their own capacity or their neighbours' wants, ends in discomfiture; and some unfortunates have no wheel at all to turn—they merely sit. But Perthes achieved the highest thing; both to work energetically himself, and to set every other person with whom he came in contact, into useful activity. This is a truly kingly habit of mind, which if Julius Cæsar and Napoleon Buonaparte possessed in a high degree, certainly this North German seller of books possessed in no inferior degree. His faculty of drawing all that was good and great within the sphere of his action, into quick sympathy and living harmony with himself, is truly wonderful. Some people bristle all round with points of repulsion; and have only one small narrow slit open for the admission of other human natures into their own. Perthes, like Goethe, was quite the reverse of this. He sent out eager feelers on all sides for the reception of whatever was good, and in any wise enjoyable, into the Pantheon of his heart, rejecting only with a tyrannical resoluteness, all intercourse with every form of sneakishness and cowardice. Thus his person became a magnet round which all that was most notable in the then political, religious, and literary life of Germany, was attracted; and there are few names of any note in the world of German action or of books, which do not occur very often in the most intimate and significant relationship to this large-hearted and heroic publisher.

That he was large-hearted and heroic, not only as a tradesman—for shop-keeping also has its heroism—but as a citizen, the whole tenor of the rich political correspondence of this work proclaims. His letters form, indeed, a running commentary on

the history of his country, for the age in which he lived, and, taken along with the words of his correspondents, will form a storehouse of political intelligence for the future historian. As a specimen of the stout German spirit that sustained him during the worst days of Prussian degradation and French prestige, we select the following:—

“It was with bitter vexation and deep sorrow that he witnessed the stolid apathy which, since the peace of Luneville and the Diet of Ratisbon, had fallen upon men who were regarded as the pride of Germany, and from which neither the unutterable sufferings of their native land, nor the audacity of their tormentors, could arouse them. He was indignant at the appearance of Goethe's *Eugenie* at this season. ‘Our hearts must and should be filled with shame, burning shame, at the dismemberment of our fatherland,’ he writes to Jacobi in 1801; ‘but what are our noblest about? Instead of keeping alive their shame, and striving to gather strength, and wrath, and courage to resist the oppressor, they take refuge from their feelings in works of art!’ A new hope of deliverance dawned, when, in the summer of 1805, the report of an alliance between England, Russia, and Austria, was propagated. But Perthes saw with dismay the political leaders of Germany array themselves on the side of Napoleon against England, and strive to work upon the minds of the people through the leading journals. ‘Our journalists,’ he writes, ‘take up the cause of the tyrant and the “Grande Nation,” either from meanness, stupidity, fear, or for *gold*. I need name only Woltmann, Archenholz, Voss, and Buchholz;’ and in a letter to Müller of the 25th of August, he gives vent to his stifled feelings. ‘Your letter distressed me, by the deep emotions that it stirred in my soul. If such men grow faint-hearted—what then? I am not so hopeless; my courage, indeed, has grown of late. True, I am young, and not well read in history. From the past you form conclusions as to the present, and so despond! But has not every people, till consolidated into unity, been ready to receive a leader, a deliverer, a saviour? This readiness is, I think, very observable among us. There is a universal panting, longing, grasping after some *point d'appui*. Much is already cleared away; I instance only this,—the end of the paper times. Twenty years more of such coquetting with literature, such playing at intellectual development, such hawking of literary luxury, and we, too, should have passed through a *siècle littéraire* still more insipid than that of our neighbours. Are not our youth now persuaded that the country does not exist to serve knowledge, but knowledge to serve the country? How many are now convinced that strength and virtue grow out of moral principles, and are the fruit of no other soil! Do not men regard the love and care for their own houses as more important than a widely diffused love capable of no intensity? Are they not now disposed to honour a hearty and even passionate love of country, rather than a cold cosmopolitanism? And even as regards religion, although through the long-standing abuse of theological

tenets, infidelity and indifference have struck their roots deep in our soil, still the want of religion is increasingly felt. I grant you that a miracle must be wrought before the country or the people can again have a faith; but then many, many lament this, and would pray without ceasing to revive the religion of the nation. Ought we not to feel ourselves great," he added, "just because we are born in such evil times?"

This is in the genuine old Roman vein. "*Ought we not to feel ourselves happy just because we are born in such evil times?*" To read this is easy; but to say it and to do it at the needful moment, is the business of a hero. After the peace of Tilsit, when Müller the historian, and other influential Germans accepted places of honour in the newly-created kingdom of Westphalia, and thus gave the sanction of their name to the favourite idea of Napoleon—the merging of Germany in France, Perthes kept aloof, and in his own sphere as a German publisher, organized a periodical for the purpose of keeping alive the embers of patriotism, and preparing fuel for the flames of liberation that must one day burst out. He was encouraged to do this, not only by the essential manliness of his political character, but by his lofty idea of the intellectual vocation of the German people in the great world of modern literature and speculation. The following passage indicates a vivid perception of the strong and weak points of the German character:—

"We Germans have never been wanting in great moral and intellectual pursuits of a general nature; we have always devoted ourselves to knowledge for its own sake. Has not Germany, for many years, been the general Academy of Sciences for all Europe? All that was discovered or expounded, felt or thought in or out of Germany, was at once generalized by the Germans, and elaborated into a form which might further the progress of humanity. In so far as we Germans had any vitality, we had it not for ourselves alone, but for Europe. We have every right to take credit to ourselves for intellectual wealth and for depth of character, but, alas! we have never known how to use our treasures. We have never given a general education, or a general business aptitude to our people; nor have we ever founded those national institutions which would have a tendency to keep alive the feeling of national honour, and which might preserve us from the aggressions of foreign enemies. That which we think and have thought can only be real and influential, when we shall have learned to act as well as to think."

In the eventful year 1813, Perthes played an active part in the events which commenced in the temporary expulsion of the French from Hamburg, and its speedy re-occupation by Davoust. The French, on re-entering the town, proclaimed a general pardon; but ten names were excepted from the grace,

and among these was that of Perthes. To escape a rebel's death by the hangman's hands, he was obliged to flee; his premises and dwelling-house were taken possession of by the Government, and his property was sequestered. He had not a penny in his pocket. But the "mental sprightliness" which Niebuhr so much admired, and the buoyancy of a faith which rode lightly over the flood-tide of misfortune, never deserted him for a moment. "The man who has nothing to repent of," thus, at that time, he wrote to a friend, "has also nothing to complain of. I have acted as in the presence of God. I have often risked my life, and why should I be dispirited because I have lost my fortune? God's will be done." God was a tower of strength to him as to King David in his affliction; and he in his turn became a tower of strength to other men. "Your indomitable spirit," wrote the Duke of Augustenburg, "fills me with admiration. Your belief in a higher world is a great matter; it is this belief alone which is the source of your strength." Niebuhr felt convinced that Perthes had a clear call from Providence in those days, to leave his private station, and devote himself as a public man to the service of his country. "Would to God," wrote the great historian, "that you would now step forth as a statesman to our fatherland! I call to every man who has love, to tell me how you can in future be brought into the administration of Germany." But, though clear-sighted, and gifted with a sagacity and strength that might have made him a great statesman, Perthes preferred working for his country as a simple citizen in the sphere of life to which he had been bred. He knew that men, like trees when the roots have struck deep, will not bear transplanting. He knew also, that men without office are often the most useful to men in office, and he had learned by experience that "the voice of an honest man is a mighty power." Such, in fact, was the confidence reposed in him by all parties, that, in December of the same eventful year, he was deputed to represent the Hanse towns at the Diet of Frankfurt, where the affairs of Germany were to be deliberated on; and here it was that he entered into that more intimate relation with the stout-hearted Baron von Stein, which was so congenial to his own character. In May 1814, when the Hamburgers had finally got rid of "that wild fellow, Davoust," Perthes returned to his home and to his business; and there, in the years following the second Peace of Paris, digested with much more wisdom than most of his ardent contemporaries, the transition from the poetical Kaiser of patriotic imagination, to the prosaic BUND of diplomatic reality. He was a man of large and liberal views in all things, but by no means possessed with the then fashionable

rage for pure Constitutionalism, according to French or English models. "We Germans," wrote he to a friend, "are so little acquainted with public affairs, and have so little talent and training for public business, that *a strong and firmly established monarchic government will still be necessary for us.*" For Liberalism, as it was commonly understood by those who imported that word from France, he had no respect; for true liberality, he always said, is that which is the fruit of love,—and love is not necessarily stronger, but often weaker, in the minds of those who are most impatient of restraint, and most possessed by the mere idea of freedom.

In the year 1822, Perthes, being now fifty years of age, made a transfer of the bookselling business in Hamburg to his partner Besser, and removed his own residence to Gotha, where he henceforward devoted himself exclusively to that publishing business, which has connected his name so inseparably with some of the most valuable departments of the German literature of the present century. Those who know how much Gotha, and other German towns, have been metamorphosed under the influence of railways, gas-lights, and hotels for English tourists, during the last thirty years, will read with pleasure the following description of the place, as it was when it first became the residence of the distinguished publisher:—

"Together with the rest of Germany, Gotha was dragged into the whirlpool consequent upon the first French Revolution; but however strongly the period, dating from Luneville to the second peace of Paris, had convulsed the whole country, it had not been able to overcome the tenacity inherent in German character and outward circumstance. In many a small state the good old times had passed over unchanged into a new epoch, and in the Duchy of Gotha when Perthes first settled there in 1822, both town and country afforded a picture of manners, customs, and regulations, which carried one back to the years immediately preceding the Revolution. Every evening the streets of one-storied houses were filled with cattle returning from pasture, and by night the only sound heard in them was the loud horn of the watchman and his pious caution,—'Put out fire, and put out light, that no evil chance to-night, and praise we God the Lord.' The streets were lively only on the weekly market-days, when the robust form of Thuringian peasants, with their gaily dressed, healthy-looking wives and daughters, selling corn and wood, butter, flax, fruit, and other country and forest produce, filled the square in front of the old town-hall, on whose roof a greedy-looking wooden head opened its mouth wide at the striking of the hour, as if uncertain whether to speak or bite. There were a multitude of strange relics of a past time which met the stranger at every step, though the inhabitants of the place hardly remarked them. Day by day a little man, in a blue coat with shining buttons, mounted on a pony smaller still,

might be seen wending his way amid the confusion of heavily laden waggons, which were wont to rest a night in Gotha on their way from Frankfurt to Leipsic. This functionary was the Weimar escort, the terror of the waggoners, looking out for any defaulters among them who had not paid the tax formerly levied in return for an armed escort, which served as protection against the assaults of knightly highwaymen. Long as this custom had become obsolete the fee was still rigidly exacted, as well as the town-toll, from waggons which were not permitted to go through but only around it. Not less notable to the youth of the place were the giant forms of the guard, with their wide white cloaks down to their heels, their great swords at their side, their heavy boots and clattering spurs, though horses they had none. Peaceful, friendly, obliging people they were, carpenters, locksmiths, joiners, who, while following their respective trades, were accustomed to figure as warriors, so many times a month for a moderate compensation. There were only about six or eight uniforms for the whole body, which were passed on from one to the other. Any one crossing the town at mid-day, was sure to meet an elder scholar, followed by ten or twelve smaller boys, running in breathless haste through the streets, singing a chorus the while, in hopes of thus collecting a few pence. On Wednesdays and Saturdays the choristers of the Gymnasium stationed themselves, in their black cloaks and three-cornered hats, before the doors of the wealthy, thus, by means of their persevering quartetts, extracting enough to support them during their school career.

"As for family life and social intercourse, nothing could be more simple. The men assembled in the evenings in groups, composed of those of the same trade and condition, and enjoyed their long pipe over a glass of beer, and even the woman-kind of the more cultivated families made afternoon visits to each other's spinning rooms. The theatre consisted of a large room in a mill, where all classes, indifferently, night, for a zwanziger, gain admission to the benches, from whence to contemplate the strolling players. Any expensive outlay in eating and drinking was reserved for extraordinary occasions; the rooms were, according to the old fashion, small and low, the furniture, generally of deal, was at the very utmost of the cherry-wood of the district, and, in short, unostentatious comfort and scrupulous cleanliness everywhere prevailed. In trade and business too the old customs still endured. The different guilds were assiduous in preventing those who were not members of them from procuring employment; the saddler might not make a portmanteau, the locksmith was forbidden to interfere with his brother of the anvil, and the tailors were sure to institute a crusade against any needlewomen who might venture to overstep the limits of their peculiar calling; the right of brewing was confined to certain firms, which, according to rule and precedent, supplied the citizens with a beverage, thin and sour enough. All intercourse with the small villages around was carried on by means of a walking post, who indulged in a perpetual warfare with the post-office authorities of Thurn and Taxis. The Thuringian

forest was only traversed by the Tambach and Schmalkald roads, and though the great highway through Gotha from Leipsic to Frankfurt was kept alive all the year by countless waggons, it did not yet boast a mail; and when, in the September of 1825, the first Diligence entered Gotha, the whole town assembled to gaze on the phenomenon, and for months nothing was spoken of but the energy of the Postmaster-General, Nagler, who had actually brought seeming impossibilities to pass. In other directions the roads were impassable after rain, and journeys, whether of business or pleasure, had to be postponed till dry weather."

In this old-fashioned petty metropolis of a petty principality, and in the midst of a society where a numerous local noblesse, with little property and much leisure, played a much more important part than to a vigorous independent man would be at all agreeable, did Perthes commence that grand publishing career, the importance of which has been felt in every corner of educated Europe, from Athens to Edinburgh. What a high-minded and spirited publisher can do for the intellectual advancement of his country, has never been more strikingly shewn than in the twenty-one years during which Perthes was the soul of the business at Gotha. With a keen eye for the wants of the times, and following also the guidance of his own practical mind, he at once felt that history was the department in which he could hope to achieve the greatest things; and after five years of hard labour, he was able, in 1827, to announce that "*history of the States of Europe, by Heeren and Ukert*," all the volumes of which may be now said to be an essential component element of every good historical library. Nothing great is ever achieved without great difficulties and a great soul to grapple with them. In a letter to the Baron von Gagern—a well-known political character—Perthes expresses himself with his usual heroic hilarity as follows:—

"Your excellency will smile at my believing it possible to unite learned Germans in a common enterprise. I know the difficulties, perfectly. But no one can influence the world by himself, and he who is too wise to be helped will never do great things in any department. I hope, by this truth, to overcome even the sensitiveness of the learned who wish only for good society, that is to say, their own. I do not despair. I have the gift of uniting the dispersed, bringing the distant near together, and tuning any discord of heart and mind amongst right-feeling men. This is the plough I have ploughed with all my life."

How clearly he knew his faculty, and how efficiently he exercised it, is proved by the mere enumeration of the names of the men who contributed to his great historical library. Heeren, indeed, was too far advanced in life to give anything but his

name and advice to the undertaking: but we have Geijer, Von Camper, Mailath, Pfister, Stenzel, Dahlmann, Lappenberg, Leo, Scheffer, Rommel, Sartorius, Droysen, Ranke, Ritter, and others. Besides history, Perthes was led by the character of the times, and by his own eminently Christian sympathies, to take up the department of theology; and here, also, we find he has been able to bring together a galaxy of illustrious names, such as only a publisher of the most catholic tendencies, and the most comprehensive activity, could have attracted. In the theological list we find the well-known names of Neander, Ullmann, Umbreit, Tholuck, Twisten, Sack, Ackermann, Nitzsch, Olshausen, and Bunsen. The well-known Theological Review, "*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*," was projected by him. Of this work, indeed, he was not merely the publisher, but also "the counsellor and fellow-labourer of his sincere friends the editors." He also published a select edition of Luther's works, and in this, and a thousand other ways, acted as a powerful counter-influence to the Rationalistic theology of Paulus, Wegscheider, and Bretschneider, then so much in vogue. In short, whether at Hamburgh or Gotha, he became the living centre of whatever was noblest and best in the intellectual and moral activity of his country. Bookmaking men of all sorts and of all capacities felt themselves happy in being united for a patriotic object under the leadership of a clear-headed, strong-minded, thoroughly honest, and essentially noble-minded man of business.

The relations of an extensive business, ramifying itself in various directions over the whole of Germany, as well as his own many-sided and receptive character, led Perthes, at different periods of his life, to make journeys through various parts of Germany; and on these occasions he comes into actual contact with many celebrated men, whose measure he knows to take with that sagacity which belongs to a first-rate man of business, and whose more striking points he portrays with a pencil that never weakens what is strong, or blinks at what is dubious. He reverences all that is good and great; but never allows respect for a far-sounded name to cheat him even into a momentary abnegation of his right of trying everything that is presented to him by a sure standard, higher than any merely human thing can realize. At Bonn, in 1824, he saw Niebuhr, one of his oldest friends, but from whom he had, since 1814, been separated by a political quarrel. The account of the meeting is interesting:—

"I was prepared for a painful meeting, and should not have wondered at a distant manner, or formal bearing on Niebuhr's part; but, the very moment I saw him, I found the old heart and the old friend,

and there was not a shadow of reserve between us. His wife had just given birth to her second son, and the three elder children were running about their father's room, with all their playthings; and during our conversation, I was engaged first with one and then with the other of them. For five days I daily spent several hours with him. Our conversation was almost entirely political. Niebuhr's disposition is very melancholy; the purer his heart, the deeper his sensibilities, the more he feels the want of some firm support for his soul; he fights with uncertainty, and quarrels with life. He said to me, 'I am weary of life, only the children bind me to it.' He repeatedly expressed the bitterest contempt for mankind; and, in short, the spiritual condition of this remarkable man cuts me to the heart, and his outpourings alternately elevated and horrified me. To see such a heart and mind in the midst of the convulsions of our time gives a deep insight into the machinery of our poor human life. Niebuhr needs a friend who would be a match for him; he has not one such in the world. The wealth of his intellect and the extent of his knowledge are absolutely appalling, but his knowledge of the present is only the result of historical inquiry and political calculations—he does not understand individual or national life. 'I do know and understand the people,' replied he, when I made the above remark to him; 'I read, and inquire, and hear; and my residence abroad has afforded me an impartial point of view.' And yet I maintain he has no knowledge of human nature. One thing I am more and more sure of: men of giant intellect and high imagination are little fitted to govern; the practical man, if he will avail himself of the intellects of others, makes the best minister.' A few days after Perthes had left Bonn, Niebuhr wrote to him as follows: 'The unlooked-for pleasure of seeing you again still remains in the form of memory; your visit has awakened the illusion that old times have not quite vanished. And yet they have; and could I become a sceptic, I should begin by denying a man's identity at different epochs of life.' Perthes wrote in reply, 'You yourself would afford me a proof of identity if I needed one. Only look within you, how love has endured, how much you are still the same! Thirty years ago I have seen that very same love shine forth from your whole being, which still has power to melt all the frost, and rub away all the rust of the world.'"

Of Niebuhr, whose weak point seems here correctly indicated, there are other notices in these volumes from which we shall add only this one extract:—

"In Niebuhr there is a strange mixture of the statesman and the *savant*, of refinement and awkwardness; yet he is a truly great and noble man. He keeps himself quite independent, and says openly whatever he thinks. Before I saw him, a man high in office said to me, with a dash of envy, 'Niebuhr can say and do what would be allowed in no other person; he is a crony of Schleiermacher, is often with Cousin, and enjoys the unlimited confidence of the Crown Prince, who is ever asking what Niebuhr says of this and that.'"

Another widely-known name among the notables whom Perthes saw at Bonn, was A. W. Schlegel. Of him he writes thus :—

“Schlegel expressed himself very strikingly about the men and the occurrences of our own time. I called his attention to the importance, historically speaking, of a new collection and edition of his works. He owes it to the history of our literature, to shew the origin and the aim of his detached essays, so as to prevent further misunderstanding and confusion, for however different the decision of different parties respecting him may be, still his views, his criticism, his praise and blame, will have considerable influence over our literature for all time. Schlegel agreed with me, and remarked that he must needs be much misunderstood, for that his labours in the early part of his life had almost entirely consisted in reactionary efforts against particular errors and perversions, and that his views had met with such a one-sided apprehension, and been carried to such extremes by his adherents, that he had subsequently been obliged, for truth's sake, to appear as their opponent. But he added, that his position, in regard to his brother Frederick, prevented an edition of his collective works. They had formerly accomplished the greater part of these together, but their opinions were now diametrically opposed on the most important subjects. He could not give up his own convictions, and his feelings forbade him publicly to oppose his brother. I then requested him to prepare a posthumous collection of his works, saying, that when our race is run, natural ties cease to fetter, and that the open confession of what each held to be truth would do honour to both. Schlegel spoke very openly of his relations with Niebuhr. The latter is so offended with his criticism on his Roman History, that he will not see him. ‘Niebuhr,’ said Schlegel, ‘has no ground for this; no one made such efforts as I to follow him in his investigations in all directions, and this is the highest proof of appreciation and respect. Niebuhr might have forgiven me a few witticisms and jests, which he knew to be a part of my nature; but so it is, no one in Germany understands criticism, and so I keep to myself my opinion of Voss’ performances, though I could express it in three words.’ I begged him to tell them me, and he replied, ‘Voss has enriched our literature with a stony Homer, a wooden Shakespeare, and a leathern Aristophanes.’ Schlegel took me to see his Indian printing office, and I could not but admire the simplicity and practical wisdom of his arrangements; indeed, on this occasion I saw nothing but the good side of his character. His faults are better known than those of most of us, and every one speaks of his incredible vanity, but it lies so on the surface, that one can hardly suppose it sinks deep. He has always been distinguished for strict conscientiousness in all affairs of business, and now he is firmly attached to Bonn, and a regular and active life may still further improve him. Good-natured he certainly is, if not exasperated or tempted by a sally of wit.”

This passage leaves such a favourable impression on our mind of

the great Tentonic Aristarchus, that we should wish to stereotype it as it here stands for the benefit of posterity. Of Jean Paul a less flattering account is given. In the autumn of 1822, Perthes wrote from Baireuth as follows:—

"I went at eight in the morning to Jean Paul. A tall, strong, bony figure, like that of a farmer or a forester, entered the room, dressed in a hunting coat, with a badger's skin over his shoulder, and leading a white poodle by a string. As we had long been correspondents, we were soon in full talk. The wish to appear in the best light, excited Jean Paul, and, accustomed as he is only to be listened to, my sudden interpolations interrupted him, and the consequence was, that while he proved himself a worthy, truth-loving man, and although the conversation turned on the leading men and leading events in Church and State, life and literature, I did not hear him utter one significant word, one deep view, one result of great inner experience: his conversation was throughout wearisome and obscure. He gave us the narrative of his daily life, as follows:—'In the summer at six, in the winter at eight, I walk about half a mile to Frau Schabenzel's, (an old countrywoman;) the poodle goes with me; I carry my papers and a bottle in my badger's skin; there I work and drink my wine till one o'clock: then I do not drink again, but from five to seven I drink my beer as long as there is any in the jug.' For half an hour Jean Paul put us to sleep with receipts for sleeping. None of the lightning flashes and scintillations of fancy, the striking similes, or the glowing pictures with which his works abound, appeared in his conversation! I left him, convinced that the man who, as an author, belongs to the tenderest and richest minds of Germany, is not, therefore, necessarily tender and soft-hearted. After Jean Paul, I felt most interest about a certain Councillor Kraus. In order to get at him, I applied to Jean Paul, having heard that they had been friends for years. 'We are old friends, it is true,' said he, 'but now we no longer meet. But go to him, and say, that though I never will have anything to do with him myself, I have sent you to him.' Accordingly, I went. I had to go up a steep stair, at the top of which was a closed lattice, and outside hung a long wooden hammer, with an inscription above to this effect: 'He who will enter must knock hard; if the hammer is inside I am not to be seen.' So I knocked hard, and the door was opened. As I entered a large library, which swarmed with cats of every age and colour, a friendly old man, a bachelor with silver hair, and in a long dressing-gown, advanced to meet me. After I had playfully delivered Jean Paul's message, we fell into conversation. 'Jean Paul,' said he, 'is a thoroughly upright, feeling, good man, rich in heart and mind, but the blossoms of his nature will never ripen into fruit, because he has not strength thoroughly and scientifically to mature any subject; he knows much, but all he knows is in disorder and confusion, and now that his own mind can create nothing further, he has fallen into all sorts of follies.' Kraus and I parted excellent friends. 'Farewell, my dear good foe,' said he, as I rattled down the steps."

These extracts will suffice to show what valuable materials the present work contains, towards a just appreciation of the physiognomy of some of the most notable of German literary men, who, about the commencement of the present century, began to fill Europe with their reputation. But many a thoughtful reader will feel, that, in the midst of the congregation of world-famous names to which we are here introduced, the shrewd and wise man of business himself still remains the most significant. There have been personal memoirs written by persons who are nothing in their own biography, just as certain feeble landlords, entertaining a troop of literary and scientific guests, become nothing at their own dinner-table; but Perthes is none of such. In fact, there was no writer of books in broad Deutschland, how excellent soever the volumes he might publish, who lived a wiser or a nobler life than the Gotha publisher; and as a thoroughly well-conditioned and well-equipped man and citizen, he was often more than a match for the most far-sighted philosopher with whom he came in contact. Whatever they knew, he always saw where the iron lay, and was never backward to strike when it was hot. Especially, in reference to what, in England, we justly esteem so highly—character, Perthes stands behind none of the most illustrious of his contemporaries. His religious life also—or life of the “inner man,” as it is named in these pages—possesses a peculiar charm very much akin to that which gave such an extensive popularity in this country to the life of the late Dr. Arnold. The piety of Perthes was most profound; not, however, the piety of a mere devotee, or evangelical registrar of mental frames; but the piety of a man of glowing passion, of clear sense, and of sleepless energy; the piety of one who, in the most stirring times, led the most stirring life, and who could say, as few others could, “He who has only an inward life in these times has no life at all.” To those who are interested in the state of religion and theological opinion on the Continent—and there are few thoughtful Englishmen who can now afford to live altogether divorced from such an interest)—the position of Perthes, as a Christian and a thinker, is full of instruction. Perfectly free from the scholastic terminology with which his countrymen generally, to our grievous offence, delight to invest religious truth, his Christianity stands on that basis of moral and historical fact which has generally been sufficient to satisfy the practical intellect of this country. Whatever vices belong to German theology, as the theology of a people fond of speculating from the mere love of speculation, and criticising for the mere display of a hypertrophied erudition, from such vices the theology of Perthes is quite free; while, on the other hand, he is equally a stranger to the bigotry which, in this country, is

often found associated with sincere piety, and that narrowness of human sympathy which amongst us is too frequently the concomitant of religious zeal. Distinctly opposed by the ardour of his temperament to the cold dissecting rationalism of Paulus and Wegscheider, excluded by the intense concrete reality of his character from any contact with the all-comprehensive logical formalism of the Hegelians—too firm in his historical footing to be a Straussian—too distinctly definite to be content even with a Neander's catholicity; he was, on the other hand, far too clear-sighted and too generous to take part with Hengstenberg and his coadjutors, whose souls were glowing with a dark-smoking zeal against the men of Halle, and calling upon Heaven and the Berlin police to consume Gesenius. He stood exactly in that middle position which was most favourable to his vocation as a publisher, in a country so divided by intellectual parties as Germany; in a position where, without sacrificing his own convictions, he could apply either the spur or the rein, as occasion might require, to the various minds over which his widely-ramifying influence extended.

The last days of this active man's career were spent in a quiet retreat at the little mountain village of Friedrichroda, in the Thuringian forest, a few miles south of Gotha. Here, amid the joys of wood, and water, and wild-flower, and family affection,\* which to him were of all things the most congenial, honours from the great world began thickly to be showered upon him. He was made a burgess of the great book-metropolis, Leipzig; the Prince of Saxony presented him with the Cross of the Civil Order of Merit, and the University of Kiel made him a Doctor of Philosophy. This last honour amused him not a little, conscious as he was that his Latin was somewhat rusty, and that his Greek, like Walter Scott's, had never existed; he consoled himself, however, with the recollection of his Oxford colleague, Doctor Blicher; and his friends added, that if philosophy meant wisdom, he was as much entitled to the doctorate as any of the authors whose books he had published.

The wonderful activity and hilarity of his character displayed itself even to the very last. He did not lay himself down to die till he was convinced that he could no longer stand; and even

---

\* To many of the readers of these Memoirs, the exquisite picture of domestic happiness which they exhibit, will prove the chief attraction. Perthes was twice married; first in 1797, to Caroline, the daughter of the celebrated Matthias Claudius, the author of the *Wandsbecker Bote*, and of other writings of an earnest and humorous description. She was a woman of high intellect, and of deep piety,—as a wife and mother, self-sacrificing and devoted,—and altogether one of the noblest and most fascinating female characters we have ever met with. She died in August 1821; and in May 1825, Perthes married Charlotte Becker, a widow, with whom he lived in unbroken harmony until his death.

when confined to bed, the letters, books, and papers which were spread thickly around him, shewed the obstinate vital energy of a mind determined to live with emphasis as long as life remained, and "to make as few concessions to sickness as possible." For strength and comfort in the fast trying moments, he sought exclusively in the Scriptures. It is remarkable that, whereas, in his full vigour, the Epistles of the ardent and energetic St. Paul had been his favourite portion of the Bible, he now betook himself with increasing love to the Apostle John. A few days before his death, to his wife and daughter who were giving some account of a sermon which they had just heard, he said,—“Do not speculate or inquire into our condition after death; it does no good, and diverts the mind from the main point. Hold simply and firmly by that which our Lord hath told us, and do not wish to know more; read again and again the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth chapters of St. John's Gospel. He who has these, has all he needs alike for life and death.” During the last two months of his life, adds his biographer, he lived on these four chapters; and the nearer he approached to death, the oftener did he read the seventeenth. He breathed his last on the 18th May 1843; and on the 22d he was buried in the churchyard of Gotha, and his favourite hymn was sung around his grave—

“What can molest or injure me, who have in Christ a part?

    Filled with the peace and grace of God, most gladly I depart.”

- ART. VIII.—1. *Lettres du Maréchal St. Arnaud.* 2 Vols. Paris, 1855.
2. *L'Expédition de Crimée jusqu'à la Prise de Sebastopol. Chroniques de la Guerre d'Orient.* PAR LE BARON DE BAZANCOURT, Chargé de Mission en Crimée, par S. Exc. le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique. 2 Vols. 3me edition. Paris, 1856.
3. *Opening Address of MAJOR-GENERAL SIR RICHARD AIREY, K.C.B., Quartermaster-General of the Forces, before the Board of General Officers assembled at the Royal Hospital, Chelsea; together with his Summing up Address, &c., &c.* 1 Vol. 8vo. London, 1856.

WHAT may be called the domestic bearing of Great Britain during the late war will not read well in history. It was too confident at the beginning, too exulting towards the middle, and too desponding towards the end. The banquet to Sir Charles Napier at the Reform Club, the premature triumph over the supposed fall of Sebastopol immediately after the battle of the Alma, and the sudden frenzy of indignation and despair which made scapegoats of Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Newcastle, may serve to mark and illustrate the startling transitions which a nation, usually noted for firmness and steadfastness, underwent within a year. As is almost necessarily the case, the disappointment of extravagant hopes led to the temporary prevalence of an equally extravagant spirit of self-depreciation. We started with the persuasion that everything must go right of its own accord; and the first reverse brought us to the conviction that everything had gone wrong through ignorance, negligence, incapacity, or mismanagement of some sort. Neither in anticipation nor retrospection was due allowance made for circumstances—for the admitted defects of our military system—for the many adverse chances in the most perilous of games—nor for that chapter of accidents by which human events are more frequently controlled than by the wisest contrivance or the most inventive foresight. When the news arrived that our gallant army was undergoing a fearful amount of suffering from cold, hunger, and overwork, it was at once taken for granted by the most influential portion of the press, that some high functionary, or class of functionaries, must be offered up as a holocaust. The Secretary of War was naturally the first victim. A fierce onslaught was next made on Lord Raglan, who, we were assured, after leading his soldiers into unprecedented difficulties and privations, coolly left them to their own resources, and from his own comfortable quarters looked on complacently whilst they

were perishing from disease and exposure, at the rapidly accelerating ratio of two hundred a day.

When newspaper readers were getting tired of daily tirades against his Lordship, it was discovered that the formalists of the Treasury, the Commissariat, the Medical Board, and the various other departments charged with the supply and distribution of food, clothing, and other necessities to the troops, were exclusively to blame. The Roebuck Committee indiscriminately condemned all, from the highest to the lowest, who had anything whatever to do with the direction or arrangement of the expedition *from* or *at* home; whilst the famous M'Neil and Tulloch Report, giving a completely new and diametrically opposite impulse to public censure and suspicion, flung the entire responsibility of the worst evils that had occurred in the terrible three months immediately following the Battle of Inkerman, on the inertness, mistimed adherence to rule, want of resource, and general inefficiency of the military leaders, the staff, and the commissariat, on the spot. We have to thank what certainly struck us at the time to be the somewhat morbid sensitiveness of the principal officers inculpated by this Report, for an investigation which has exhausted the subject, and has at length enabled inquirers like ourselves, who have and can have no bias in the matter, to form a shrewd guess at the actual causes of the disasters in dispute. No candid person who heard Lord Lucan's animated reply, or who reads Sir Richard Airey's lucid Address, before the Board at Chelsea Hospital, will hesitate to concur in a verdict of honourable acquittal. Nor is it well possible for a reflecting mind to help arriving at the additional and far more important inference, that the national judgment has hitherto been lamentably misguided touching everybody and everything directly or indirectly connected with the Crimean campaign. We may not have proved wiser or more far-sighted than our contemporaries; but our conclusions have been always fairly deduced from the most authentic information within our reach, and we have never shrunk from modifying them as unforeseen events occurred, or as fresh glimpses of the slowly-dawning and long-observed truth broke upon us.

Sir John M'Neil and Colonel Tulloch virtually assume that a sufficient amount of stores had been forwarded from England, and were accumulated at Balaclava, but that these had been rendered comparatively useless and unavailable by the omission or refusal of the Quartermaster-General and others to dispense with technical forms, or to depart in any manner from the prescribed routine of regular and ordinary duty. The distinct answer of Sir Richard Airey is, that no such feeling or spirit was manifested in any quarter; that the forms in question were

instantly superseded by authority, or set aside by common consent; that the most praiseworthy zeal to assist and co-operate with one another, unimpeded by etiquette, and without reference to any real or supposed line of demarcation between departments, was uniformly displayed by the officers of both services; and that the virtue of moral courage or readiness to encounter responsibility, was no more wanting on occasions that demanded it, than the commoner one of physical bravery.

"Why was it, therefore," suggests Sir Richard Airey, "that an army ever victorious against the enemy in the field came to be so fettered in its power of aiding itself, that no efforts on the spot could entirely avert from the men a period of privations and grievous suffering,—this I must regard as a question beyond the proper reach of an officer who stands here to justify his own conduct, and not to throw blame upon other men. But I hold in deep reverence the memory of him who never breathed into the public ear one word of defence for himself; and, perhaps, I may be suffered to remark, that that very calmness and noble composure with which our chief met the pressure of adverse times, has, even to this day, concealed from the understanding of most men, the true magnitude of the trials and dangers which beset the allied armies in the winter of the first campaign."

There were other causes of concealment and misunderstanding, which have done more than rob Lord Raglan's name and memory of their well-earned and befitting illustration. The national character and military reputation of the British people have been mischievously impaired by them, and in our opinion the time has arrived when these causes should cease to operate. We allude to the overstrained courtesy and the by no means flattering consideration for the supposed sensitiveness of our allies, which have hitherto induced Englishmen to bear any amount of censure, or (what is worse) to throw any amount of censure upon their own countrymen, rather than point, even by way of comparison, to the cotemporaneous miscalculations, failures, or sufferings of the French. It was known all along to the principal officers of the British army, and was speedily bruited about in Paris and London, that the French troops were not much (if at all) better clothed, fed, or sheltered than the British; that in some respects, as in the important article of tents, they were actually worse off; and that they lost proportionally a greater number of men from sickness and exposure. It was also known, that, in more than one critical emergency, the nations seemed to have changed characters, and that the French declined to co-operate in movements, advances, or assaults, which, perilous as they might have been, were pronounced by the calm and cautious judgment of the British chiefs, to be indispensable to the

success of an expedition indubitably conceived and undertaken as a *coup de main*. But whilst the war lasted, hardly a whisper, allusion, or insinuation to this effect was hazarded, either in Parliament or by the press. "It will offend the Emperor; it will endanger the alliance,"—was the invariable objection, whenever an attempt was made to shew that the overwhelming superiority of our gallant allies in military organization, and their presumed exemption from all the evils of wintry warfare, were a myth. English ministers, English administrators, English officers, and English soldiers and sailors, were deemed bound to endure every description of imputation that it might please members of the legislature, journalists, correspondents, or annalists, to cast upon them, rather than run the remotest risk of exciting a feeling of wounded self-love in a rival (if now friendly) nation, or of provoking a frown on an imperial brow in the Tuileries.

Such forbearance might have been politic and enduring, had it been mutual and reciprocated; but the precise contrary is and was notoriously the fact. Whilst we, in this country, studiously and systematically refrained from mentioning a deficiency, or recording an incident, that could be twisted to the disadvantage of the French, their leading journals were unceasingly active in drawing exaggerated pictures of the results of our military mal-administration, and in basing on it exulting prophecies of the rapid decline of our representative institutions and political liberties. We remember reading an official article, in which it was logically laid down,—1. That the conduct of a war is the grand touchstone of good government: 2. That the war with Russia had been admirably conducted by the French administrators, whilst, so far as the English were concerned, it had been one concatenation of blunders: 3. That the régime of Napoleon the Third was and is the acmé of perfection, whilst the mixed constitution of England is the *ne plus ultra* of absurdity. Q. E. D.

The two French publications named at the head of this Article will naturally be regarded by future historians as first-rate, if not quite unimpeachable, authorities. How, viewed by their light, or appreciated by their standard, will the British army stand with posterity? How, so far as their influence extends, does it now stand upon the Continent? The first on the list contains the private letters of the French Marshal, in which he confidently attributes almost the whole of the success which had attended the expedition till his death, to his own firmness in counsel and energy in action. The second is the composition of a gentleman, expressly charged by the Minister of Public Instruction (as stated on the title-page) with the duty of writing the history of

the campaign from information collected on the spot, and from documents supplied by the officers in command, to whom he is especially recommended by no less a personage than the Minister of War.\* What his private instructions may have been, we must not presume to guess; but, judging from the result, we should infer, that one of the most urgent was to omit no opportunity of eulogizing his imperial master, and to be diligent in impressing the cardinal doctrine, that English slowness was a constant drawback on the chivalrous impetuosity, or the *élan*, as he calls it, of the French. In his first letter after Alma, Marshal St. Arnaud writes,—“*Je suis resté douze heures à cheval, et toujours sur Nador, qui a été magnifique, galopant au milieu des balles, le soir comme le matin.*” This description of Nador would do for M. de Bazancourt. He is “magnifique” after the same fashion. He is galloping from morning to night among bullets; or when there are no bullets, his lively fancy pictures them flying round him, and he prances about with all the dignity of danger and the flourish of bravery just the same. His character may be collected from a few sentences of his preface:—

“I have interrogated, I have listened, I have written. Not a day passed without its task and its toil. What was still more precious to me, was to initiate myself by daily contact into this military life, unknown for me,—to follow it day by day, hour by hour, minute by minute,—to inspire myself with the manly emotions of the combat,—to hear, day and night, the reverberating sound of the cannon and the musketry,—to see the obscured sky suddenly lighted by salvos of bombs,—to go over the trenches, to find in them our brave soldiers, some behind the embrasures, armed with their muskets, others bending over their spades and turning up the earth, to march with a slow but sure step up to the besieged town. . . . I lived this life with joy, with enthusiasm. If I had the sad picture of the dead and the wounded before my eyes, other moving scenes of terrible struggles, of audacious attacks, soon diverted my thoughts. What a fine life, and how I wish I were in it still!”

The style of the whole book is in keeping with this curious introduction. Instead of the narrative of a calm observer, who has scrupulously collated conflicting accounts, we have the highly-coloured impressions of a partisan, whose head is never cool for half an hour at a time, and who has inspired himself to such an extent with the “*mâles émotions du combat*,” that he cannot shake off the intoxication during peace. St. Arnaud

---

\* The formal disclaimer that has appeared in the *Moniteur* is understood to have been put forth to anticipate any complaint or objection that might otherwise have arisen on the part of the British Crown, and has not, in the smallest degree, affected the circulation or authority of the book on the Continent.

was a man after M. de Bazancourt's own heart,—gallant, high-spirited, flashy, and melodramatic, with national excitability raised to fever height by disease. Accordingly, all the glory that could be extracted from the conception or execution of any combined military movement during his life, is unhesitatingly monopolized to gild his memory.

It is admitted, that the invasion of the Crimea was mainly owing to the positive instructions received by Lord Raglan from the English Government; but it is positively and repeatedly stated, that the French Marshal invariably took the lead in the councils of war, and that, when the rest of the assembled chiefs were wavering, he compelled, persuaded, or shamed them into unanimity. Now, we have heard on tolerably good authority that, even after the expedition had set sail, the French commander became suddenly alarmed at its rashness—that a message was conveyed to Lord Raglan to request him to attend a conference, with the view of reconsidering its expediency—and that he excused himself on the ground of the roughness of the weather, and merely sent an officer of his staff, with whom, of course, no essential change of purpose could be discussed. If any one man were to be singled out as the soul of the expedition, it would be Lord Lyons. As regards Lord Raglan, from the moment he had made up his mind to carry out the wishes of his Government, which were also those of the British people, he gave no further thought to the obvious difficulties and dangers of the undertaking, except to decide how, with the limited means at his disposal, they might be best overcome or guarded against. His army were animated by the same spirit. Not so the French officers and soldiers, who are by no means so prone to surrender their right of private judgment. Their strategic prejudices were shocked and confounded by the irregularity of the whole proceeding; and they required some weeks after the landing to recover from that fluttered and flurried state which so frequently led them to complain of their more sedate and less mercurial allies as slow. We are not going to rewrite the battle of Alma; but we must revert to two or three of its most remarkable episodes, if only to suggest that there are British as well as French versions of the facts.

M. de Bazancourt relates, with the graphic detail and coloured language of the novelist, how, on the morning of the battle, the French Marshal being informed that the English had not come to time, sent Colonel Trochu to remonstrate with Lord Raglan:—

“‘My Lord,’ said the Colonel, ‘the Marshal thought, after what you did me the honour to tell me yesterday evening, that your troops, forming the left wing of the line of battle, were to advance at six.’”

“‘I am giving the order,’ replied Lord Raglan, ‘we are getting

ready, and about to start : a part of my troops did not arrive at the bivouac till the night was far advanced.'

" 'For heaven's sake, my Lord,' added the Colonel, 'be quick, every minute of delay destroys a chance of success.'

" 'Go and tell the Marshal,' replied Lord Raglan, 'that at this very moment the orders are given along the whole line.'

"It was half-past ten when Colonel Trochu announced that the English were ready to march. But all these unexpected delays, and the indecision in the movements which necessarily resulted from them, no longer permitted the plan of battle to be executed such as it had been primitively conceived. The Russian army, instead of being surprised by a rapid manœuvre, as it should have been, had time to make its dispositions whilst following from the heights the motions of our army, which was advancing in perfect order, in the midst of an immense plain."

With English readers, the alleged conversation between Lord Raglan and the aide-de-camp will merely excite a smile. It is true, however, that Lord Raglan refused to gratify French impatience by moving before his ammunition had come up, and it would have been well, as will presently appear, if our gallant allies had adopted the same precaution. But it is not true that any delay on the part of the English necessitated any essential alteration of the original plan, which was not carried out because the French failed to perform their part. Lord Raglan waited nearly two hours in momentary expectation that they would advance in force to turn the position, instead of leaving him to take the initiative by attacking in front, at the certainty of an enormous sacrifice of life. It is quite true that the Zouaves behaved with their wonted gallantry, and got near enough to threaten the Russian flank. It is also true, that those French commanders, particularly Prince Napoleon, who were nearest to the enemy, became alarmed, and that message after message arrived to say that they were *compromis* or (as some say) *massacrés*. But so far as could be ascertained from the central station occupied by Lord Raglan and his staff, the French had contented themselves with vigorous skirmishing, and not one of their columns had advanced to the assault, or been engaged, when Lord Raglan, seeing no other alternative left to him, took the bull by the horns, and, with little aid from the promised diversion, ordered the formidable heights before him to be carried at all hazards. He then, followed only by his staff, crossed the river, and at considerable personal risk, reached a knoll or hillock, which commanded a full view of the scene of contest, and enfiladed, as it were, the Russian defences which his troops were climbing the hill to assail. His quick eye instantly fell upon two large columns of Russian infantry, drawn up to support their

artillery. They were within range from the knoll, and on a sign from him Colonel Dickson galloped off for a couple of guns, which were brought up within a few minutes. The first two shots missed, but gave the alarm to the gunners of an advanced Russian battery, who moved off with their guns. Each succeeding shot told with fatal effect on the two devoted columns, who, after ten or twelve rounds had been fired, fell back in confusion. The Russian artillerymen, abandoned by their supports, limbered up their guns and left the field. This was the turning-point. The British crowned the heights, and the Russians were retreating, before they were assailed in force by the French.

M. de Bazancourt calls the taking of the telegraph tower by the French troops *l'épisode le plus saisissant de la journée*, and exclaims: "There is the battle—there are the genuine efforts of the attack and defence!" Describing the assault, he continues,—“It is a human torrent that nothing can stay. Colonel Cler arrived first at the tower—all followed—all arrive ardent, impetuous, irresistible. It was a short struggle, but one of those bloody, terrible struggles, where each man fights body to body with his enemy, where look devours look, where the hands are locked, where the arms strike fire, clashed one against the other. Dead and dying are heaped up together, and are trod upon and stifled by the feet of the combatants.” The slender foundation of fact on which this bombastic description rests, seems to be that, towards the end of the struggle, there was a smart hand-to-hand fight in and about the telegraph tower, the approach to which was steep and defended by riflemen. But the Russian guns could not be sufficiently depressed to sweep the acclivity with grape, as was the case with the heights which fell to the share of the British; who bore the brunt of the battle, and suffered accordingly. The official returns represent them as having lost, in killed and wounded, only one-third more than the French; but the wonder at the time was, where the bodies of the French killed had got hidden, for very few were to be seen. There was a rumour that, by some extraordinary mistake, deaths from cholera were computed amongst their killed, but that the error did not extend beyond the non-commissioned officers and the rank and file. This may help to elucidate an otherwise unaccountable fact in which all the Returns agree, namely, that the French had only three officers killed, and the English twenty-six.\*

M. de Bazancourt says, that if the English cavalry had not got *embourbée* in the Alma, the retreat of the Russians might have been turned into a rout. He ought to have known that

---

\* Bazancourt, vol. i. p. 242. *Lettres de St. Arnaud*, vol. ii. p. 494.

the English cavalry were quite ready to act, but were kept in check by a far superior force of Russian cavalry. He might also have learnt that, when Lord Raglan urged the advance of Prince Napoleon's division to improve the advantage, it was intimated that their ammunition was expended—it did not appear on whom—and that they were waiting for a fresh supply. This inopportune deficiency might have been avoided, had they imitated that deliberative foresight which had provoked so much impatient censure in the morning.

St. Arnaud, in a letter to his wife, dated *Champ de Bataille, le 21 Septembre 1854*, appropriates the whole honour of the victory. "I attacked at eleven; by half-past four, the Russians were completely routed, and if I had had cavalry, I should have taken more than ten thousand prisoners—unhappily I have none." . . . "I have twelve hundred men *hors de combat*; the English fifteen hundred." The Marshal adds,—“The turning movement (*mouvement tournant*) that I ordered, and which decided the victory, was perfectly executed by General Bosquet. The ear of his horse was carried off by the fragment of a shell. The enthusiasm of the troops is admirable. *Vive l'Empereur! Vive le Marechal!* was their cry throughout the day. All the army loves and has great confidence in me.” In a letter of the same date to his brother, the solidity of the English troops is acknowledged, with the qualification that “the French have shown themselves what *they* are, the most brilliant soldiers in the world.” The day following, he writes to his wife: “Our weather is that of the French June. The sky is with us, but the English are always delaying me.” To his brother: “The English are not yet ready, and I am detained here as at Balchick, as at Old Fort. It is true that they have more wounded than I, and that they are farther from the sea.” The same complaint is repeated by M. de Bazancourt, who remarks: “The English, intrepid and indefatigable in battle, seem not to comprehend the imperative importance of a day, or an hour, of delay in an operation of war: they do not know how, or do not wish, to make haste.”

They certainly prefer proceeding on the *festina lente* principle. They do not hurry forward without due preparation, nor do they, when once set in motion, allow themselves to be checked by the first unforeseen obstacle. The French impetuosity was unluckily liable to be cooled down by the suggestions of prudence at periods peculiarly fitted for its display; and whenever an important point was to be gained by a dashing movement or sudden onslaught, it was not English slowness or caution by which the progress of the allied armies was delayed. Thus, as M. de Bazancourt states, when they arrived at the Belbec, “they

learnt that works had been constructed which commanded the mouth of the river, and cut off their communication with the fleet, and that exterior works had been recently erected round Fort Constantine to render the approaches difficult and deadly." But he omits to add, that these might have been carried with no greater sacrifice of life than would have been amply justified by the object and the stake. The works on the Belbec lay so exactly in the French line of march, that for the English to have assaulted them would have been an affront. Lord Raglan wished and expected them to be carried by the French; but St. Arnaud, who was then sinking fast, positively refused to hazard an immediate assault, and it was mainly in consequence of this refusal, that the flank march, reluctantly suggested by Lord Raglan as the best remaining alternative, was resolved upon. There is good reason to believe that, if these works had been forced, the army might have succeeded in occupying such a position on the North as to have brought the expedition to a successful issue within the month.

The intelligence which arrived about the same time of the desperate step taken by the Russians of blocking up the mouth of the harbour of Sebastopol, by sacrificing a portion of their fleet, may have accelerated this change of purpose. It seems to have been regarded by the French as analogous to the burning of Moscow, and to have evoked corresponding associations of alarm; but it did not alter the conviction of Lord Raglan and Lord Lyons that the best chance of success lay in adhering to the original plan of the expedition, and in conducting it through-out as a *coup de main*.

M. de Bazancourt states, that the progress of the troops, after crossing the Belbec, was repeatedly delayed by the English. We are assured, on the most unimpeachable authority, that the English, who took the lead, were frequently obliged to wait for the French. Lord Raglan's eagerness to get forward was proved by an accident, the curious details of which are not told by M. de Bazancourt. His Lordship was riding in advance of his troops, attended only by a part of his staff and an amateur, when the lifting of a bough, as they were on the point of emerging from a wood, displayed the Russian rear-guard within less than a hundred paces of them. Lord Raglan made a sign for all to remain quiet, and despatched an *aide-de-camp* for the light cavalry, who came up in about twenty minutes, and speedily converted the retreat into a rout.

It was from the bivouac on the Tchernaiia, on the 26th September, that Marshal St. Arnaud surrendered his command. His illness and death were amongst the most deplorable fatalities of the expedition. With all his defects, he had some eminent

qualifications for his post. He was chivalrously brave. His adventurous life had familiarized him with perils and risks of every kind; and, until enfeebled by ill health, he was not liable to be unduly moved or shaken by the sense of responsibility. His successor, General Canrobert, a brave and intelligent officer, was overwhelmed by it. Indeed, it is now well known that, in an interview with Lord Raglan after giving up his charge to General Pelissier, he frankly owned his weakness, and said that the English commander ought to congratulate himself on the change, since he (Canrobert) should never have had the moral courage to co-operate in any movement involving extraordinary sacrifices or risks.

This feature of his character was displayed on the second day after he assumed the command. In the council of the 28th, Lord Raglan proposed to assault the place at once, and it is now known that the south side would have been immediately evacuated if assailed. The formidable Malakoff was then a half ruined tower; the Mamelon was actually in our occupation for a period; the ranges and tiers of earthworks, which have immortalized Todleben, were hardly commenced; the Russians were few in number, and their spirits were broken by defeat. On the other hand, Canrobert urged the imminent danger to which his troops would be exposed if they got entangled in the narrow streets of a strange town, with the broadsides of the Russian fleet, which still mustered in threatening array, pouring into them;\* and he asked, emphatically, what the Emperor would think if no use were made of the splendid siege-train which had been sent out. We suspect that the Emperor would have been much better pleased, if the desired object could have been attained without the exposure (that speedily ensued) of the insufficiency of the artillery on which he prided himself, and to the perfecting of which his own personal attention and boasted science had been especially applied.

Even M. de Bazancourt cannot deny or gloss over the palpable failure of his countrymen in this essential arm, on the first opening of the fire on the 17th October. After treating his readers to some of his most elaborate flourishes touching the service of the French batteries, some of which he describes as *superbes d'énergie et d'élan*, he is brought to the melancholy confession, that, at half-past ten, the commandant of artillery ordered the complete cessation of their fire; "our batteries, reduced to three, not being able to reply without disadvantage to the cannon of the place. The fire of the English

---

\* If, as we believe was proposed by Lord Lyons, the Malakoff had been taken, and a battery erected on it, the Russian ships would have found their position untenable.

continues without their works receiving any sensible damage; their cannon of large calibre do great harm to the enemy." He had stated just before, that "for a moment there was reason to believe that the superiority of our (the French) batteries over those of the town would speedily permit us to attempt the assault, for the eventuality of which all had been prepared, and columns designated beforehand." Here then is another undeniable instance in which the delay of a decisive moment was exclusively attributable to his countrymen. It was they, in fact, who changed the entire character of the expedition, and engaged the invading force in operations for which it was necessarily unprovided and originally unfit. Our meaning will be best illustrated by a quotation from General Airey's address:—

"In the first place, I must observe, that at the time of the embarkation, and from that time until the 17th October, (the day of the first bombardment,) there was no expectation whatever of having to winter in the Crimea, and that no final determination to do so was formed until after the Battle of Inkerman.

"It was anticipated that, during the winter, the force would have its head-quarters in the neighbourhood of the Bosphorus, and I have reason to believe, that in the first week of September, and after we had embarked on the expedition, Lord Raglan was corresponding on this subject with the British Ambassador at the Porte.

"And here, too, I may be permitted to state my opinion, that the responsibility of the general and officers engaged in the invasion of the Crimea was not a responsibility of the same description as that which attaches to the conduct of ordinary warfare. Marshal St. Arnaud and General Lord Raglan—under very decisive instructions from one at least of the governments at home—determined to make a descent upon the enemy's coast, and to attempt a rapid military enterprise against the stronghold of Sebastopol; *but they never proposed nor intended, and certainly were not prepared, to invade Russia by regular operations in the field, i.e., by the advance of an armed body connecting itself by sufficient means of transport with the 'base of operations.'*"

"In that sense the allied forces were not an 'army'—they would be more properly called a 'moveable column.'

"The difference between the two descriptions of force is well marked by the difference in the requisite amount of land transport.

"It was estimated that, to move as an 'army,' the British force alone would require 14,000 beasts of transport. Yet the force landed with only 70 transport animals for the Commissariat Service, and the additional quantity obtained in the neighbourhood of Old Fort did not, I believe, swell the whole quantity of Land Transport animals for commissariat purposes to more than between 300 and 400.

"The French, I believe, landed with no transport animals except for their ambulances, and only obtained a small number in the country

near the landing-place. Yet they would have required (even with their then strength,) as much transport as ourselves, if they were to operate as a regular 'army.'

"A moveable column has certain advantages, and especially that of being rapid in its operations; but the well-known drawbacks to the employment of such a force are these:—That it is adapted only for temporary use, and that it is exposed to great risk—not to the ordinary risk of mere defeat and consequent loss, but to the risk of total destruction. Certainly the expeditionary force which landed on the beach at Old Fort could not have been expected or intended to enjoy that degree of security which belongs to regular operations. It is the clear right of the Government, when it thinks fit, to order the forces of the country upon highly perilous service. The enterprise was, of course, well known to be hazardous, and was to be undertaken nevertheless. Lord Raglan, if I mistake not, so understood his instructions, and he was not the man to disobey them."

This state of things, taken in connexion with those defects of system to which we adverted in a former Article, may help to account for most of the privation and suffering that ensued, without imputing grave blame to any individual commander, minister, administrator, or departmental head. All things considered, the design of the expedition reflects no discredit on its originators, whose only palpable mistake was in supposing that so composite a force, under two generals of co-equal authority, could be safely charged with its execution. The popular charge of improvidence against the British Government is answered by the abundance of clothing and provisions which, at the most trying period, had accumulated in and about Balaclava, and by the rapidity with which the loss of the Prince, with the other effects of the hurricane, were bountifully repaired. The alleged want of a reserve is hardly to be reconciled with the reinforcements which reached the British army in rapid succession, or with its numerical strength and admirable order at the close of the war. Neither can it be fairly argued that the home administration only learnt wisdom by experience, or were taught it by the least indulgent of their critics; for so soon as the nature of the enterprise underwent a complete change from circumstances over which they had no control, they lost not an hour in adapting their measures of supply and co-operation to the emergency. This is amply proved by the generous and highly honourable declaration of Lord Panmure in the House of Lords, that almost all the most efficient steps, regulations, or contrivances by which the condition of the troops was so strikingly improved in the spring of 1855, had been ordered or set in motion by his much-maligned predecessor, the Duke of Newcastle. The railway, which did so much to supply the deficiency of land transport, was submitted to the Cabinet and sanctioned by them early in Decem-

ber 1854. When facility of communication between the harbour of Balaklava and the camp was fully re-established, the worst difficulties were at an end; and the essential want, which led to or lay at the root of every other want, was a good road. Why was it not made at the proper season? Because the required number of men could not be spared from the still more imperative duty of guarding the trenches, and of providing against the eventualities of the hour. There is no longer any discrepancy of opinion upon this point; and now they know that, when the road was made, it occupied 2000 men for six weeks, sundry non-military critics may feel ashamed at the freedom of their comments on this fancied instance of glaring neglect.

The positive and irritable gentleman who took the lead in conducting the miserably miscondacted inquiry before the Sebastopol Committee, thought he had got the Duke of Newcastle into a dilemma, when his Grace stated that neither the French nor English Government had contemplated the contingency of the army wintering on the heights before Sebastopol; in other words, that they had planned a *coup de main* by what Sir Richard Airey terms a "moveable column," not a regular siege with a "base of operations" and all other regular supports and resources. Let us see whether the military leaders on the spot, with far superior means of weighing the contingencies of their situation, exhibited more foresight, or were likely to have quickened his Grace's apprehension of coming events.

"On the morning of the 17th of October," says Sir Richard Airey, "the allies opened fire against the outworks of Sebastopol. The cannonade proceeded with good success on the part of the British artillery, and it was the disastrous explosion in the French lines, and the crushing fire to which their batteries were exposed, which prevented the then intended assault. The damage sustained by our allies compelled some delay, but it was still hoped that the place would be taken by assault, and indeed a day—a near day—was fixed for that operation."

"But the probability of a long struggle now suggested itself. Up to this time most officers had, I believe, anticipated the speedy capture of the place; others, less sanguine, may have thought that the enterprise would prove to be impracticable, and that the allies would have to embark, and winter in the neighbourhood of the Bosphorus; others again may have thought it probable that the forces might hold possession during the winter of a considerable portion of the enemy's territory, as, for instance, the country between Eupatoria and the Belbec; but I never heard of any one who contemplated beforehand the event which actually occurred, namely, that of camping on the heights before Sebastopol, and being constantly engaged, through the whole winter, with an enemy vastly superior in force, and at a distance of some miles from our sea communications."

"Now, however, Lord Raglan prepared for the possibility of such an event, and took his measures accordingly."

"In the early days of November, the enemy received great reinforcements, and the position of the allied armies became critical.

"On the 5th of November the battle of Inkerman was fought, and on the following day a protracted consultation as to the further conduct of the campaign took place between the allied generals. The result of this consultation was a determination to persevere in holding the ground then occupied by the allies; to fortify our position on the Inkerman heights; to defend the advanced trenches with firmness, and even if possible to carry forward the approaches. This resolution to hold the advanced trenches, and to maintain an attitude of attack, imposed upon the troops great sufferings, and labour beyond their strength, but I have never yet heard a doubt that it saved the allied armies from a great disaster.

"Lord Raglan knew but too well the full import of his decision. He knew that it involved great evils, but he chose it nevertheless to avert a greater catastrophe. In the one alternative he saw for his troops a period of conflict by day and by night, great labour and suffering, and heavy losses. In the other alternative he saw how ruin would begin with the loss of our siege-guns; how, then, the enemy, ascending to the present ground of the allied camps, would take up a position on those heights, arm his batteries with the resources of an arsenal containing some 7000 heavy pieces of artillery, and then push forward with a converging fire and an overwhelming superiority of numbers upon Kamiesch and our gallant allies, and upon the little basin of Balaclava, and the devoted remnant of the British army.

"Lord Raglan grieved, but did not hesitate, for there was only one of the alternatives which seemed to consist with the honour of the British arms. Now then, *for the first time*, we knew that the army would winter on the Ridge."

They had to hold their ground until the "moveable column" should grow into a powerful and well-appointed armament. They were to do this in defiance of climate, and under daily and nightly liability to attack. It will be remembered that when the allied army landed in the Crimea, the British were slightly superior in number, although it had always been understood that the land force should be principally supplied by France, by way of set-off to our larger quota of ships. As already shewn, the brunt of the battle of the Alma was borne by the British, who had also, during the winter of 1854-55, both the lion's share of the fighting and the hardest of the work. This was the natural result of their position, which was advisedly chosen by the British Commander, under a conviction that the safety of the entire army depended on their "solidity;" and even the French generals admitted that they could not answer for their troops under circumstances so trying as those which found and left that same solidity unshaken at Inkerman. Yet the French writers take advantage of this very self-sacrificing

spirit in our Commander and our troops, to represent them as constantly on the point of being overwhelmed and swept away until aided by the French. What is this but the condition of every advanced body placed to receive the first shock? If such doctrines are to be accepted, the honour of victory should be invariably awarded to the supporting columns or the reserve. When General Bosquet gallantly came to the rescue at Inkerman, he was fighting for the safety of the whole allied army, which would have been "rolled up" and driven into the sea, if the Russians had won the day. He was posted for the express purpose of supporting the British; and the services he really rendered us were rather by keeping the enemy at bay, and so preventing a renewed assault, than by the active and determined share in the conflict which M. de Bazancourt assigns to the French; whose principal losses on the 5th November were incurred in repelling a *sortie*, and defending their own trenches.

His account of Colonel Steel's interview with General Bosquet is obviously incorrect; and descriptions like the following carry their own refutation, in the shape of ridicule, along with them. "Other English officers hurry up, animated by the combat, excited by all these dead bodies with which the ground is heaped; *the sides of the horses are torn by the spurs of the horsemen, and blood is mingled with the foam.*" Such is the style in which battles are described by the historian selected by the Minister of Public Instruction to record the exploits of his countrymen for the edification of their posterity. The following pithy colloquy is alleged to have taken place between the two commanders-in-chief in the crisis of the fray:—

"The situation was critical, every hour seemed to aggravate it; for the Russians in the same moment were crowning the crest of the *plateau* of Inkerman, and their masses were becoming more and more formidable.

"Lord Raglan shook his head, and with the calm which never left him,—'I believe,' he coolly remarked, 'that we are very sick,' (*très-malades.*)

"*'Pas trop,* however, my lord, it is to be hoped,' replied General Canrobert."

Nothing can be more unlike Lord Raglan, whose look, tone, bearing, and attitude in all critical emergencies, were the admiration of both armies, and repeatedly averted the growing feeling of despondency, by which exertion might have been fatally paralyzed.

"In these times of trial,"—to quote the eloquent testimony of his friend and attached follower, Sir Richard Airey—"he ceased to be equal with other men, for his personal ascendancy gave him a singular

faculty of carrying his fixed determination into the minds of those who approached him.

"Without dissembling facts, he would calmly withhold his assent to all gloomy apprehensions, and manfully force attention to the special business in hand, and thus,—or rather, perhaps, by a kind of power which cannot be traced or described in words,—he threw upon those who conversed with him the spell of his own undaunted nature. Men went to him anxious and perturbed: they came away firm."

When, after the repulse at Inkerman, the Russians were retreating in confusion, Lord Raglan earnestly pressed General Canrobert to bring up the right wing of his army, and attack them as they were crossing the bridge. He declined, saying, "it was best to leave well alone,"—nearly the identical form of expression used by Sir Harry Burrard when refusing to follow up the earliest of the Duke of Wellington's (then Sir Arthur Wellesley's) peninsular successes. The French general saw and frankly admitted his error when too late.

If we cannot acknowledge an overwhelming debt of gratitude to our allies for coming to our support when we were keeping the common enemy at bay for the common safety, still less have we to thank them for any especial readiness to relieve us from an unequal share of the labours of the siege. Assuming the constant influence of a truly generous rivalry, and the entire absence of national jealousy and selfishness in both officers and troops, these labours should and would have been apportioned precisely as if a homogeneous force had been assembled under the command of a single chief; in which case it is not conceivable that one division should have three times as much trench work or field work as another. Yet there was a period when the British infantry had only one night in four allowed for rest, whilst the French had five in six; and it was not until Lord Raglan emphatically dwelt upon the physical impossibility of prolonging this state of things, that Canrobert (about the middle of January) agreed to occupy a part of the ground hitherto assigned to the British. But he made it a condition that our cavalry should be posted on the *plateau* several miles from their supplies, and thus became indirectly responsible for the lamentable condition to which they were speedily reduced.

Still as much cordiality as could exist between men of such opposed characters continued to prevail between Lord Raglan and General Canrobert, till the French Emperor fell into the strange error of supposing that he could advantageously direct the operations of the allied army from Paris. He sent over a plan which M. de Bazancourt describes as a masterpiece of strategy, but which, unluckily, could not be executed without throwing away the labours of the preceding portion of the siege. The

salient feature of the project was, that the English troops should form a separate army of operation under Lord Raglan. His Lordship expressed his willingness, provided the English trenches were occupied by the French. This being declined, he suggested that they should be intrusted to the Turks—a suggestion which was set aside by the French generals with a shudder. “Then how are the English to act in sufficient force in both places or capacities?” was the next question; whereupon General Canrobert leaned his head upon his clasped hands and exclaimed, —“*Oh, Milord, prenez le commandement vous-même.*” This meaningless expression of embarrassment is amplified by the historian into a formal offer:—

“Here we find, again, the elevation and nobility of character of the General-in-Chief. To arrive promptly at a happy result, to remove the difficulties, to smooth the obstacles, he proposed to Lord Raglan to leave him, in these circumstances, the supreme command, and earnestly entreated Omer Pacha to act like him, and to accept, on his side, the supreme command of Lord Raglan. The latter was for an instant astonished at this proposal, for there was in it an abnegation for the public good, often difficult even to the most elevated hearts. It was, moreover, a heavy responsibility, the sudden weight of which alarmed the English General. He first refused, then hesitated, then accepted, and forthwith demanded that the French troops should be charged with the occupation and defence of the English trenches. This strange proposition could not be accepted.”

If Lord Raglan was to have the supreme command, it was surely competent to him to order the French troops into the trenches whilst the English took the field. But the bare supposition of such an offer and acceptance is an absurdity—for what authority had General Canrobert for such a step? or how would he thereby have carried out the wishes of his imperial master? After the enforced recall of the Kertch expedition, he evidently saw that imperial interference had rendered his own position untenable, and not venturing to resist it, he resigned. The appointment of General Pelissier infused new spirit into our allies. His express instructions were to regulate his own and the Emperor's views as much as possible by Lord Raglan's. The expedition to Kertch was resumed, and was attended with the desired success; although truth compels us to add that it did not enhance British admiration for the discipline of French troops, or the efficiency of the French marine. Two anecdotes, which we have carefully verified, must suffice on these subjects.

An officer high in rank on General Sir George Brown's staff, had made himself laudably conspicuous in repressing the marauding propensities of our allies. He was warned to keep a sharp look-out to his own safety, and not without good reason;

for one day as he was returning to the town alone, at a short distance from the French quarters, two *chasseurs* took each a deliberate shot at him with their rifles. One bullet rattled through a tree above his head; the other struck the ground close to his horse's fore-feet. They were about two hundred and fifty paces off, and much less than that distance from their quarters, which they reached before he had got near enough to cut them down or identify them. They remained undetected and unpunished.

During the expedition to Kinburn, a division of French and English gun-boats were ordered to pass the Russian fortifications during the night, and take up a position within the spit. The Russians threw up blue-lights, and opened a brisk fire. Within ten minutes the whole of the French gun-boats were on their way back, whilst the English held steadily on and reached their destination. Before the division started, the British admiral (Lyons) fully explained his views to the captains of the English gun-boats, but left them ample discretion to act according to emergencies, subject to the significant proviso that they must get in. The French admiral (Bruat) issued more than a hundred written orders to the captains of the French gun-boats, in which he provided for every imaginable contingency; and he was beyond measure astonished at the course pursued by the British admiral, declaring it to be tantamount to an abdication of authority. His mortification was extreme, when, taken aback by an unforeseen contingency, and shrinking from responsibility rather than from danger, the officers, whom he had so carefully indoctrinated, returned for fresh orders with their mission unfulfilled.

Till General Pelissier took the command, the Zouaves alone had fully maintained their brilliant military reputation, but during the remainder of the siege, the French troops rushed to the assault in a manner which would not have disgraced the proudest of the days (Marengo, Austerlitz, &c. &c.) which they are so fond of recalling. Their claim, however, to the entire glory of the final capture, because they took the Malakoff and the British failed at the Redan, is preposterous. Is the long train of struggle, triumph, and heroic endurance, which exhausted the enemy and paved the way for the crowning success, to go for nothing? We failed where, by common consent, success was well-nigh hopeless; for the Redan was defended by an army to which our attacking detachments were as one to ten; the intervening space, about 250 yards, was swept by grape and musketry; and there was a high parapet to scale. The French confessedly failed from nearly similar causes, in three out of their four attacks, namely, at the Little Redan, the Bastion de Mat, and the Central Bas-

tion. They flung themselves upon the Malakoff in greater numbers, including the supports, than the total of the British army : they had only a few yards to clear : the Russians were taken by surprise ; and our unsuccessful attack effected a most opportune and essential diversion in their favour. Honour to whom honour is due : they fought admirably on this day ; but the closing scene of the great drama must not be extravagantly glorified, apart from the long acts, crowded with interesting incidents and important episodes, that led to it and formed the indispensable conditions of its success.

With the view of illustrating the time-honoured defects of our military organization, we took a cursory view in a preceding Number, of the principal campaigns and expeditions in which the British army was engaged during the revolutionary war. Every one of these was shewn to have been chequered by reverses and periods of suffering, strikingly analogous to those sustained by our gallant and much-enduring troops before Sebastopol. Nor is this the only moral to be drawn from our military history. We may also learn from it that the proudest of our triumphs were not unattended by startling alternations of fortune, nor won without an average amount of miscalculation or mishap on the part of those whose names are gloriously and imperishably associated with them. Take, for example, the conquest of Quebec by Wolfe. How few know, or how seldom is it remembered, that all the early stages of this expedition were a succession of failures ? The original plan of it, as laid down by Clatham, was speedily abandoned. The meditated junction and co-operation with Amherst and Johnson were found impracticable. Wolfe lost a quarter of his little army by sickness, and another quarter in a rash and ill-managed attempt to cross the river and attack the French lines, which ended in a signal discomfiture. " On the 9th of December, therefore," says Mr. Massey, " he sat down with a heavy heart to write the despatch which should prepare the minister and the country for the disappointment of their hopes. The only benefit that he could hold out as the result of the well-appointed expedition under his orders was, that by maintaining their ground they should keep the enemy in check, and so prevent his aiding in the defence of the fortified lakes, in the reduction of which Amherst was supposed to be engaged. Despair, however, had not subdued either the faculties or the energies of Wolfe."\*

Most fortunately, too, for his own and his country's honour, Wolfe was at full liberty to follow out the suggestions of his own daring and inventive spirit. His force was exclusively composed

---

\* *A History of England during the Reign of George the Third*, vol. i. p. 45.

of English ; and his movements were not dependent on those of an over-cautious colleague or ally. His admirably combined project was carried out without hesitation or delay ; and " the intelligence of his victory and death," adds the same historian, " arrived in England only three days after the publication of that despatch by which he had prepared his country for the failure of the service intrusted to him. The revulsion of the public mind was therefore the greater at this glorious disappointment of their general's gloomy anticipations." Who can say that a similar revulsion of the public mind might not have been produced by Lord Raglan, had not the French commander so repeatedly damped his prudent and politic ardour ? At all events, let the fullest and calmest consideration be given to appeals like the following :—

" It was from his loyal alacrity in undertaking a great and hazardous enterprise, and afterwards under fair stress of war—war with the gathered forces of the Russian empire—that Lord Raglan, still victorious in the field, became surrounded by an accumulation of military difficulties for which it would be hard to find a parallel in all the annals of war.

" Those difficulties he faced and conquered. Of the sufferings, the gallantry, and the splendid achievements of our allies, it is not for me to speak ; but of our own army I can say, that for full forty days it stood in great straits and peril ; and the courage of the British soldier, sustained by Lord Raglan's unshaken firmness, was strong enough through all that dreadful time to save the force—not indeed from hardship and cruel losses—but, thank God, from all military disaster, and to hold fast the precious ground from which—in easier times—the allies were destined to make good their conquest of the enemy's stronghold.

" Our chief, as you know, did not live to see that day. Toiling always from the early morning, and continuing his labours deep into the night, and bearing in his own noble way those cares and sorrows which fall to the lot of a British Commander in the field, he sank and died in the midst of us all, at head-quarters, before his great task was done ; but if there was glory for the allies in the fall of Sebastopol, it will sooner or later be seen and understood, and be ever thenceforth remembered, that that great result was prepared by the audacity of the original invasion and the enduring heroism of the winter campaign ; and the more the singular history of those transactions shall become known, the greater will be the pride with which our countrymen will cherish Lord Raglan's fame."\*

The greater, also, will be our pride in the indomitable courage and heroic powers of endurance, strengthened and exalted by the admirable discipline and high moral training, of the British

\* *Opening Address of Sir Richard Airey, p. 171.*

soldier. Great pains have been taken to propagate a belief of his inefficiency, as a member of an organized body, if not as an individual combatant; and the warlike nations of Europe are by no means indisposed to listen to depreciating theories or statements affecting a prosperous and haughty rival. But the military critics of the Continent are not really deceived. The invasion of England, which many of them discussed as feasible and probable not four years since, is now universally regarded as chimerical; and until all recollections of the Crimean campaign have died out, no rational Frenchman will foster or fan the hope of wiping away, except in peace and amity, any rambling recollections of Waterloo.

- ART. IX.—1. *Papers relating to Oude.* (Printed by Order of Parliament.)  
 2. *The Private Life of an Eastern King.* 2d Edition. London, 1856.  
 3. *Speech of W. S. Seton-Karr, Esq., at the Court of Proprietors of India Stock,* May 14, 1856.  
 4. *Farewell Minute of Lord Dalhousie.* 1856.

SCARCELY seven years have passed since in this Journal we chronicled the incidents attending the "Fall of the Sikh Empire." Midway in that interval of time two great principalities—the one in the heart of the Indian peninsula, the other far down on the south-eastern coast of the Bay of Bengal—the one by lapse, the other by conquest, have been added to our empire in the East. And now in the year 1856, it is announced that another great tract of country has been absorbed; and that a kingdom yesterday governed by an independent native sovereign, is now a British province, administered by a Commissioner, under the orders of the Governor-General of India. And so the red hue, which in our coloured maps of India indicates the British territory, is rapidly spreading itself over the entire sheet.

We purpose in this Article to speak only of our last acquisition—of the assumption or annexation (the word matters not) of the famous principality of Oude. The story is told very clearly and circumstantially in the "Papers" before us. These papers, we have good authority for stating, are an honest collection (not a selection) of public documents. The whole history of this great event has been given to the public without any reservation. Not a single despatch of any importance has been suppressed; not a single document has been garbled. No future historian will ever be able to expose the mutilation of state-papers for the purpose of converting the real story of the annexation of Oude into a florid romance. No truth has been perverted, no reputation lied away, by the omission of passages containing the very pith and substance of an official record. No awkward manuscripts can come to light, in any future day, to fill up concealed chasms, and brand with dishonesty the compilers of the Oude Blue-Book. A more reliable collection of State-papers, we believe, was never given to the world.

Whatever may have been the character of the transaction, here, at least, we see the worst of it. Oude has changed masters—why and how these papers amply declare. They might well be left to tell the story for themselves; but three hundred closely-printed folio pages are more than most people will care

to read; and we believe, therefore, that we shall do good service by showing, as concisely as we can, how Oude became a British province.

Rightly to understand the matter it should be known, *in limine*, what was the kingdom of Oude, *before* it became a British province. We must waste no sympathy on the extinction of an ancient sovereignty. Before our political connexion with the peninsula of India, Oude was a province of the Mogul empire. The Governor of Oude was no more an independent sovereign than is the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland—the Governor of Guernsey—or the Lord Mayor. When the empire was distracted and weakened by the invasion of Nadir Shah, the treachery of the servant was turned against the master, and the governor little by little began to govern for himself. But he continued to profess allegiance to the House of Delhi. He held only an official, though a hereditary title, by which he acknowledged his vassalage. And long after the Great Mogul became a mere pensioner and a pageant, the Nawab-Wuzeer of Oude was nominally his minister. He only became a “King” in 1819, by sufferance of the British Indian Government. There is no need to disguise the fact, though not a creditable one, that he bought the title from the Governor-General of India. Engaged in an extensive and costly war, Lord Hastings wanted money for the prosecution of his great enterprises. There was always money in the treasury of Lucknow. Little was ever spent on internal administration, and the British Government had protected the principality against all hostilities from without. There were cash-balances, therefore, for princely uses; and a crore of rupees advanced at the right time, turned the Nawab-Wuzeer into the King of Oude. Sir John Malcolm said that the very mention of “His Majesty of Oude” made him sick. “Would I make,” he said, “a golden calf, and suffer him to throw off his subordinate title, and assume equality with the degraded representative of a line of monarchs to whom his ancestors have been for ages really or nominally subject?” But the golden calf was made; and from that time the kingdom of Oude was formally recognised by the British Government, and “His Majesty” became a fact.

It was believed by Malcolm and others, at this time, that the assumption of the royal title might raise ambitious hopes incompatible with the real position of the new king, and that he might be impelled, either by his own aspirations, or by the promptings of others, to aim at the acquisition of an amount of actual political power, such as could never be conceded to him by the lords-paramount of India. But the rulers of Oude were not men of this temper. They may have been too wise—or they

may have been too feeble and too indolent—to make any attempt to acquire what was as far beyond their reach as the sovereignty of the moon. They continued, as kings, what they had been as Wuzeers, the faithful allies of the British Government. The very nature of the alliance, indeed, rendered it impossible that any hostile efforts directed against the British power should bring anything but disaster and disgrace upon Oude. So the kings of Oude never dreamt of war; but gave themselves up wholly to pleasure.

Of this alliance we now purpose to speak. In the year 1801, Lord Wellesley being then Governor-General of India, the Nawab-Wuzeer entered into a treaty with the British Government, by which, after ceding to the East India Company, in perpetual sovereignty, certain portions of his territories, (in place of the money-payments which he had previously undertaken to make for the support received from the British troops,) he engaged to “establish in his reserved dominions such a system of administration to be carried on by his own officers, as should be conducive to the prosperity of his subjects, and be calculated to secure the lives and properties of the inhabitants;” and he further pledged himself “always to advise with, and act in conformity to the counsels of the officers of the East India Company.” On their part, the British Government undertook to defend the remaining territories of the Wuzeer “against all foreign and domestic enemies,” provided always, that the British Government were empowered to station its troops in such parts of the Wuzeer’s dominions as might “appear to the said Government most expedient.”

There is little to be said in favour of the system here indicated. But it was not originated by Lord Wellesley. It had existed many years before that great statesman appeared upon the scene. It had long been the custom of the Company to let out their troops, for a consideration, to the rulers of Oude; first, in an irregular sort of way—job-work—as in the famous ~~or~~ infamous case of the Rohilla massacre; and afterwards under treaty, by which a certain number of men were planted in the Oude territories, for a certain sum of money to defend the said territories against all enemies. Lord Wellesley inherited this state of things from his predecessor, (Sir John Shore,) who had placed Saadut Ali on the musnud, and undertaken to support him there. The number of our troops, however, was found insufficient, especially as there was an apprehension of an invasion from Afghanistan; so Lord Wellesley increased it; and the better to provide for the payment of the force, dismembered the principality and annexed certain rich districts to the Company’s possessions. We thus became the perpetual defenders of Oude; and

for more than half a century the country was free both from foreign war and internal revolution.

So far the system worked well. We performed our obligations towards Oude, and really "defended" the Government of the country. But there was another kind of defence still more needed. A foreign invasion is, doubtless, a great calamity; a civil war is a mighty evil—

But worse the war which one gaunt tyrant wages  
Against a suffering people.

The British troops defended the Government against its subjects; but they did not defend the people against the tyranny of the Government. It was left to the British Resident to do this—but no British Resident, however clearly he may have seen the evil, however deeply he may have lamented, and however strenuously he may have exerted himself to remedy it, ever raised a successful protest against the measureless oppressions which ground the people to the dust. The Oude Government was protected against the people by our troops; but our Resident was powerless to protect the people. The British force, therefore, became, in effect, the shield of tyranny—the instrument of oppression. There are rulers who are to be restrained only by fear. But the rulers of Oude had no fear. The people could not resist the oppressions of the Government, because the British troops were always at hand to dragoon down insurrection, in prosecution of the scheme of internal defence.

Lord Wellesley found things in this state. He saw clearly the evil; and he was most unwilling to perpetuate it. "While the territories of the Company," he wrote to the Resident, Colonel Scott, "have been advancing progressively, during the last ten years, in prosperity, population, and opulence, the dominions of the Wuzeer, although enjoying equal advantages of tranquillity and security, have rapidly and progressively declined." "The daily increase and aggravation of the worst evils," he continued, "are notorious, and must be progressive, to the utter ruin of the resources of Oude, unless the vicious system of the native administration of the country be immediately abandoned." And he added, "I am satisfied that no effectual security can be provided against the ruin of the province of Oude, until the exclusive management of the civil and military government of that country shall be transferred to the Company, under suitable provisions for the maintenance of his Excellency and his family.

Had Lord Wellesley regarded the position of the Wuzeer only in this point of view, it is more than probable that he would have proceeded at once to the assumption of a country which

had long been so shamefully misgoverned. But there was another and a narrower point of view in which he condescended to regard the mis-government of Oude. The happiness of the people was a great thing; but so also was the payment of the subsidy. He directed the Resident, therefore, in the event of the very probable refusal of the Wuzeer to surrender the entire military and civil government of the country into the hands of the British, to demand from him such a cession of territory as would secure to us the means of paying the troops. This alternative was assented to with great reluctance by the Wuzeer; and the treaty of 1801 was the result.

It has been shown that this treaty contained a clause intended to provide for the introduction of a better system of administration into the reserved dominions of the Wuzeer. But Lord Wellesley himself, a few months before, had declared his conviction that the ruin of Oude was certain "unless the vicious system of the native administration of the country were utterly abandoned." How, then, could he expect that the establishment of any "system of administration, to be carried into effect by his (the Wuzeer's) *own servants*," could be "conducive to the prosperity of his subjects, and be calculated to secure the lives and properties of the inhabitants" of Oude? The thing, indeed, was not possible. Native administration could tend only to the utter ruin of the country.

And so the country *was* utterly ruined. The lamentable state of things which Lord Wellesley had found at the commencement of the present century, went on from bad to worse—and from worse to worst—until, indeed, it was scarcely possible for any lower depths of misrule and anarchy to be found in any part of the world. Sunk in extremest degradation, wallowing in all kinds of pollution, the rulers of Oude, whether wuzeers or kings, gave themselves up to the guidance of pandars and parasites, and cared not so long as these wretched creatures administered to their sensual pleasures. Affairs of state were pushed aside as painful intrusions. Corruption stalked openly abroad. Every one had his price. Place, honour, justice—everything was to be bought. Fiddlers and barbers, pimps and mountebanks, became great functionaries. There were high revels at the capital, whilst, in the interior of the country, every kind of enormity was being exercised to wring from the helpless people the money which supplied the indulgencies of the Court. The Wuzeer farmed out the lands to large contractors, who exacted every possible farthing from the cultivators; and were not seldom, upon complaints of extortion, made to disgorge into the Wuzeer's treasury a large portion of their gains. There was no security of life or property. Murders of the most revolting type—gang-

robberies of the most outrageous character were committed in open day. There were no courts of justice except at Lucknow; no police but at the capital and on the frontier. The British troops were continually called out to coerce refractory Zemindars. The Wuzeer knew that they would do their duty; knew that, under the obligations of the treaty, his authority would be supported; and so he lay secure in his Zenana, and fiddled whilst his country was in flames.

And so years passed. The Wuzeers became kings; each ruler, if possible, worse than the last. One Governor-General followed another. Resident after Resident was appointed, and still no change; ever went there from the Residency to the council-chamber of the Supreme Government, the same unvarying story of frightful misrule. Residents expostulated, Governors-General protested against it. The protests in due course became threats. Time after time it was announced to the rulers of Oude that, unless some great and immediate reforms were introduced into the system of administration, the British Government, as lords-paramount, would have no course left to them, but to assume the direction of affairs, and to reduce the sovereign of Oude to a pensioner and a pageant.

It would take long to trace the history of this progressive misrule—under a succession of sovereigns all of the same class—all degraded sensualists—passive permitters of evil, rather than active perpetrators of iniquity, rejoicing in the sufferings of their people. We believe that the rulers of Oude have not been Neros and Calignulas. They simply allowed things to take their course. As long as the brute creation—specimens of all kinds from elephants to quails—afforded, by the cruelties which, under skilful direction, they could be instigated to inflict on one another, sufficient diversion to the royal mind, the Oude potentates did not, perhaps, desire to see men and women “butchered to make an eastern holiday.” In the “Sultan’s solitude” of the Harem, little knowledge had they of the butcheries going on in remote parts of the kingdom. The truth never reached them from their own ministers, whose interest it was to keep the sovereign in the uttermost depths of ignorance; and when the English Resident remonstrated, the King was told by the profligate courtiers who surrounded him, that the British Government had some object of their own, in misrepresenting or exaggerating the truth.

We pass thus lightly over the first thirty years of the century during which the misrule of the Oude principality had continued to assume every year a darker hue, to pause at the administration of that truly honest and benevolent statesman, Lord William Bentinck. The Resident at this time reported that “the country

had reached so incurable a state of decline, that nothing but the assumption of the administration could preserve it from utter ruin"—nearly the same words as Lord Wellesley had uttered thirty years before. The Governor-General reflected deeply upon the subject, and sought the opinions of the most eminent Indian statesmen in the country. The great question was, whether a larger and more direct interference than had previously been exercised in the affairs of Oude—an interference extending to a peremptory dictation to the king regarding the choice of his ministers; or an open assumption of the government, would be the better and more humane course. Sir John Malcolm was consulted upon the subject. He wrote a long private letter to Lord William Bentinck, in which he declared himself,—though a strenuous advocate on general grounds for the preservation of the Native States of India,—in favour of the latter course rather than the former. "In the event of the King of Oude," he wrote, "not being able to quell disturbances he had excited, and the general peace of the country becoming disturbed in a degree that affected our own provinces, interference would become unavoidable. Such a state of affairs would render a prince incapable of fulfilling the obligations of the alliance. But even in this extreme I would rather see him deprived of power and another placed on the musnud, *or assume his territories*, than attempt to govern them through a Residency and a Minister in opposition to the nominal head of the State. Our condition forces us upon many expedients of administration, and the latter has been often tried; but I am quite satisfied that it is, from many causes, the very worst species of rule that can be adopted, both as it affects the temper and happiness of the people and the good name of the British Government."

If there was any man in India, at this time, who in respect of extensive knowledge of the country and large political sagacity could be compared with Sir John Malcolm, that man was Sir Charles Metcalfe. He declared that the worst possible mode of dealing with the evil was the selection of a minister of our own in opposition to the wishes of the king. "We set up a servant," he said, "and enable him to domineer over his master. The servant becomes despotic ruler. He governs as he likes, and most probably very ill; but by obsequiousness and ready attention to every desire, he blinds our representative to all his misdeeds, and persuades him that none other in the land is so fit to carry on the government. The master remains degraded in the power of the servant; and if ever he feels uneasy in his thralldom, and makes an effort to shake it off, the interference of our representative is irresistibly exercised to confirm the power of the Minister and rivet the chains of the Prince. Far preferable

would it be, I conceive, to assign a suitable stipend, and the honours of his rank to the prince, and to take the administration of the government into our own hands. Whatever would warrant the virtual deposition of the prince, through the imposed domination of a minister, would equally justify the preferable and more effectual remedy." "But," he added, "it must be an extreme case to warrant either." Thirty years before, Lord Wellesley had thought that there was then "an extreme case:" and, certainly, the evils which then seemed to warrant the direct assumption of the government had not diminished in the interval.

By no man was the principle of non-interference supported more strenuously, both in theory and in practice, than by Lord William Bentinck. But in the affairs of this Oude state he considered that he was under a righteous necessity to interfere. In April 1831, he visited Lucknow; and there, distinctly and emphatically told the King that "unless his territories were governed upon other principles than those hitherto followed, and the prosperity of the people made the principal object of his administration, the precedents afforded by the principalities of the Deccan, the Carnatic, and Tanjore, would be applied to the kingdom of Oude, and to the entire management of the country, and the King would be transmuted into a state prisoner." This was no mere formal harangue, but the deliberate enunciation of the Government of India; and to increase the impression which it was calculated to make on the mind of the King, the warning was afterwards communicated to him in writing. But spoken or written, the words were of no avail. The King appointed an unworthy minister; threw himself more than ever into the hands of parasites and favourites; plunged more deeply into debauchery than before, and openly violated all decency by appearing drunk in the public streets of Lucknow. With the corruption of the Court the disorders of the country increased. The crisis seemed now to have arrived. A communication was made to the Court of Oude, that "instructions to assume the government of the country, if circumstances should render such a measure necessary, had arrived, and that their execution was suspended merely in the hope that the necessity of enforcing them might be obviated." But no such hope really existed. There was no attempt at reform; no symptom of improvement. So the British Government saw clearly that the time had come when any further hesitation to assume openly the management of affairs would be culpable weakness. Arrangements for the transfer were therefore commenced; and the short-lived dynasty of Oude seemed to be at the point of extinction.

Affairs were in this state, when, on the 7th July 1837, the King (Nussur-ood-deen Hyder) died—not without suspicion of

poison. But he was a confirmed drunkard, and the symptoms attending his decease might, perhaps, have been produced by the strong drinks to which he was habitually addicted. When his death was announced there was a disputed succession. A reputed, but unacknowledged son of Nussur-ood-deen was set up as an aspirant to the throne, in opposition to the claims of the late King's uncle, Nussur-ood-dowlah, who, as the nearest surviving male relative, was by the Mahomedan law entitled to succeed. By the extraordinary coolness and courage of the Resident, Colonel Low, and his assistants Captains Patton and Shakespear, who were for some time in imminent peril, the insurrection was quelled. And Nussur-ood-dowlah, an aged, infirm, but well-disposed man, became sovereign of Oude.

The accession of a new king, who in no small measure owed his elevation to the support of the British Government, seemed to afford the means of solving a pressing difficulty. But we have arrived now at a point of the narrative, which requires that we should take a retrospective view of the opinions and measures of the Court of Directors of the East India Company. There had been no hope for Oude under its old master. The misrule had reached a climax at which it seemed impossible to suggest any remedy short of the total extinction of the sovereign power under which the country had been brought down to the uttermost depths of misery and humiliation. Lord William Bentinck—a statesman of high principle and moderate views—had, as we have said, after a personal inspection of that troubled country, and the most earnest consideration of the duties imposed upon the British Government by the long continuance of the disorders which were eating into it, declared his conviction that nothing short of the virtual deposition of the King, and the transfer of the entire administration to British agency, could restore the land to a state of prosperity. In a minute, dated July 30, 1831, he half urged upon the home authorities the duty of resorting to this extreme measure, if no reform were apparent after the remonstrances and warnings which he had addressed to the King at Lucknow. He did not recommend the assumption of the government in perpetuity, but a temporary assertion of the sovereign power, a reconstruction of the administrative machinery, and a restoration, after a sufficient time, of the reformed country to its native ruler. The Court of Directors, however, were slow to adopt the recommendation. The Governor-General had closed his minute with the expression of a hope that affairs might take a favourable turn. "I am sanguine," he said, "in a great present amelioration, from my belief in the capacity, and the willingness of the present Minister to effect it, and from the entire possession he has of the confi-

dence of the King." The Home Government, therefore, deemed it their duty to allow sufficient time to elapse for the realization or the falsification of Lord William's hopes. The year 1832 passed away; and the year 1833 passed away; but the hopes of the Governor-General were not realized. In 1834, therefore, the Court of Directors considered that any further delay would be culpable. They then looked the matter fairly in the face, and addressed themselves earnestly to the consideration of the important question—"What is to be done for Oude?"

In a masterly despatch to the Supreme Government, dated July 16, 1834, they reviewed that question in all its bearings. They spoke of the feelings, which the deplorable situation of a country so long and so nearly connected with them, had excited in their minds,—of the obligations which such a state of things imposed upon them,—of the necessity of finding means of effecting a great alteration. They acknowledged, as they had acknowledged before, that our connexion with the country had largely contributed to the sufferings of the people, inasmuch as it had afforded protection to tyranny, and rendered hopeless the resistance of the oppressed.\* This made it the more incumbent upon them to adopt measures for the mitigation, if not the removal, of the existing evil. They could not look on whilst the ruin of the country was consummated. It was certain that something must be done. But what was that something to be? They might continue to interfere by advice and remonstrance alone; or they might resort to command instead of to advice; or they might take the management of the country into their own hands. All these expedients maturely considered, the last appeared to be the only one that afforded prospect of success. This was the course recommended by Lord William Bentinck; and the Court of Directors now placed in the hands of the Governor-General a discretionary power to place the Oude territories under the direct management of officers of the British Government, and to carry the proposed measure into effect at such period, and in such a manner as might seem advisable to the Governor-General, but with the utmost possible consideration for the King, whose consent to the proposed arrangement was, if possible, to be obtained. It was suggested that all the titles and honours of sovereignty should remain with his Majesty as before; that the revenues of the country should be expended in the improvement of the country, leaving either the surplus, or fixing a stipend, for the King;

\* For a long time our troops were actually employed by the King's officers to aid them, as was said, in the collection of the revenue; but in reality, as the Court said, as "instruments of extortion and vengeance." This scandal no longer existed; but our troops were still stationed in the country, ready to dragoon down any open insurrection.

and that it should be distinctly announced, that so soon as a sufficient reform had been effected, the government of the country should, as in the case of Nagpore, be restored to its native rulers.

This despatch must have reached India towards the close of 1834. At this time Lord William Bentinck, in a state of failing health, was about to retire from the government of India. In March 1835, he was succeeded by Sir Charles Metcalfe, who, as Provisional Governor-General, continually expecting the appointment of a permanent successor, was naturally unwilling to enter upon any large political measures, which might not be approved by, and might embarrass, the new Viceroy. Nothing during his administration was done either to assume the government of Oude, or to introduce any new system under its native ruler. In the early part of 1836, Lord Auckland became Governor-General of India. The duty of "doing something" devolved, therefore, upon him.

Colonel John Low was then Resident at Lucknow. We have already spoken, by anticipation, in our narrative of events in Oude, of the energy he exhibited in putting down the insurrection of the Padshah Begum. A man of high principle, firm courage, good temper, and sound sagacity, he had been reared in that admirable school of diplomacy which, under the presiding influence of Sir John Malcolm, had trained for responsible stations so many first-rate political officers; and he was largely imbued with the opinion of that eminent Indian statesman, that it was alike our duty and our policy to maintain the Native States of India, so long as they could be maintained without an utter violation of the duty of the paramount power. The despatch of the Court of Directors, authorizing the temporary assumption of the government of Oude, had been communicated to him, and he had pondered over its contents. The scheme appeared to him to be distinguished by its moderation and humanity, and to be one of a singularly disinterested character. But he was convinced that it would be misunderstood. He said that, however pure the motives of the British Government might be, the natives of India would surely believe that we had taken the country for ourselves. So he recommended the adoption of another method of obtaining the same end. Fully impressed with the necessity of removing the reigning King, Nussur-ood-deen, he advised the Government to set up another king in his place; and in order that the measure might be above all suspicion, to abstain from receiving a single rupee, or a single acre of ground, as the price of his elevation. "What I recommend is this," he said, "that the next heir should be invested with the full powers of sovereignty; and that the people of Oude should continue to live

under their own institutions." He had faith in the character of that next heir, he believed that a change of men would produce a change of measures; and, at all events, it was but bare justice to try the experiment.

But before many months had elapsed after the date of the despatch, in which Colonel Low so ably and emphatically propounded these views, without any violent interposition on our part the suggested experiment inaugurated itself. The misrule of Nussur-ood-deen was terminated by death, and the Resident was now permitted to see the working of the scheme he so warmly recommended. Lord Auckland had no desire to resort to the alternative of even a temporary assumption of the government. But the old system of administration had been found wanting; and it seemed expedient to the Government of India, in this conjuncture, to take advantage of the opportunity to introduce some large measure of reform. The Resident had obtained from the king, on his accession, a pledge to sign a new treaty, if submitted to him by the British Government. But Lord Auckland, commiserating the position of the new ruler, and unwilling to reduce him, at the very outset of his reign, to a state of absolute submissiveness, desired the Resident to "abstain from pressing him on the bond." "If there is to be a new treaty," wrote the Governor-General, in the month of August 1837, "it shall be after full discussion and free consent. The king will have the option of abiding by the treaty of 1801. But if this be his decision, he will clearly understand that he is to abide by it, and not to follow the course of his predecessors, in violating its conditions, misgoverning the country, and maintaining misgovernment by a military rabble, amounting, by Colonel Low's last return, to nearly 70,000 men. He will have time given to him gradually to reduce this force, and to put his administration on a good footing. But if, on a review of the circumstances of Oude, he thinks that an organized force in his own service, beyond the limits of the treaty, is necessary, we say, that for our security, a sufficient portion of that organisation ought to be under British direction. To this I think he will come at last. But I expect him, in the first instance, to decide upon abiding by the treaty. He seems to be an excellent and well-intentioned man."

And he did come at last to consent to this and other conditions set forth in a new treaty. His reluctance was great; but it was overcome; and on the 11th of September the treaty was executed at Lucknow. It contained, among other articles, the following important stipulation:—

"It is hereby provided, that the King of Oude will take into his

immediate and earnest consideration, in concert with the British Resident, the best means of remedying the existing defects in the police, in the judicial and revenue administration of his dominions; and that, if his Majesty should neglect to attend to the advice and counsel of the British Government, or its local representative and its (which God forbid) gross and systematic oppression, anarchy and misrule should, hereafter, at any time, prevail within the Oude dominions, such as seriously to endanger the public tranquillity, the British Government reserves to itself the right of appointing its own officers to the management of whatever portions of the Oude territory, either to a small or great extent, in which such misrule as that above alluded to may have occurred, for so long a period as it may deem necessary, the surplus receipts in such case, after defraying all charges, to be paid into the king's treasury, and a true and faithful account rendered to his Majesty of the receipts and expenditure of the territory assumed."

Another article decreed the establishment of an auxiliary force, under British officers, to be raised and maintained at the expense of the Oude Government—the force to which Lord Auckland alluded in the letter quoted above.

This treaty is known as the Treaty of 1837. There are frequent allusions to it in the Oude Blue-Book. Captain Hayes, one of the officers of the late Oude Residency, and now employed in a prominent position under the Chief Commissioner, says, "The Home authorities disapproved of that part of the treaty which imposed on the Oude state the expense of the auxiliary force, and on the 8th of July the king was informed that he was relieved from the cost of maintaining the auxiliary force, which the British Government had taken on itself. With respect to the remaining articles of the treaty, the Court at Lucknow consider that they are binding on the contracting powers; and it appears that they have received no intimation that the treaty has been cancelled; nor are they aware that it is valueless in the estimation of the British Government." Lord Dalhousie distinctly says that the treaty was disallowed, and that "the disallowance finally received in 1839 prevented any such measures as were contemplated in the proposed treaty." But in a collection of treaties subsequently published, the Oude treaty of 1837 appeared bodily, with a note attached to it, setting forth that that portion of it which related to the Oude auxiliary force had been cancelled—the inference, of course, being, that the remainder was valid. But it is, on the other hand, on official record, that, in 1838, a motion having been made in the House of Commons, for a copy of all treaties entered into with the then existing sovereign of Oude, the following return was made by the Board of Control:—

"There has been no treaty concluded with the present King of

Oude, which has been ratified by the Court of Directors, with the approbation of the Commissioners for the affairs of India.

(Signed) R. GORDON.

"India Board, 3d July 1838."

The insertion of the Oude Treaty of 1837, in the collection of treaties made in India, was simply the mistake of an under-secretary. For the treaty had been wholly and absolutely disallowed by the Home authorities. They took especial exception to the establishment of the new auxiliary force, which was to cost the Oude Government sixteen lakhs of rupees per annum; for they very honourably said that the treaty of 1801 had made it compulsory on the British Government to provide for the defence of the country, and that a large tract of country had been ceded with the express object of securing the payment of the troops necessary for this purpose. If it were now expedient to organize a new force under British officers, it was contended very properly by the Home authorities, that it was for the Company, not for the Oude Government, to defray the expenses of the new levy. But not only on these grounds did they object to the treaty. It is true that, a few years before, they had given the Governor-General discretionary power to deal, as he thought best, with the disorders of Oude, even to the extent of a temporary assumption of the government; but this authority had been issued at a time when Nussur-ood-deen, of whose vicious incapacity we had had many years' experience, sat upon the throne; and the Court were strongly of opinion that the new King, of whose character they had received a favourable account, ought to be allowed a fair trial, under the provisions of the treaty existing at the time of his accession to the throne. They regarded the new treaty as unnecessarily humiliating to the King; and they therefore forwarded to the Supreme Government directions for its abrogation—the abrogation not of any one part of it, but of the entire treaty. They gave, however, a large discretion to the Governor-General in Council, as to the mode of announcing this abrogation to the Lucknow Court—wishing the annulment of the treaty to appear rather as an act of grace from his Lordship in Council, than as the result of public and unconditional instructions from England.

The receipt of these orders disturbed and perplexed the Governor-General. Arrangements for the organization of the Oude auxiliary force had already advanced too far to admit of the suspension of the measure. It was a season, however, of difficulty and supposed danger. It was expedient to withdraw some of our regular troops from Oude for the defence of our own territories; so, in any view of the case, it was necessary to fill their places. The Oude auxiliary force, therefore, was not to be

arrested in its formation, but it was to be maintained at the Company's expense. Intimation to this effect was given to the King in a letter from the Governor-General, which, after acquainting his Majesty that the British Government had determined to relieve him of a burden which, in the existing state of the country, might have imposed heavier exactions on the people than they were well able to bear, expressed a strong hope that the King would see, in the relaxation of this demand, good reason for applying his surplus revenues firstly to the relief of oppressive taxation, and, secondly, to the prosecution of useful public works. But nothing was said, in this letter, about the abrogation of the entire treaty, nor was it desired that the Resident, in his conferences with the King or his minister, should say anything on that subject. The Governor-General still hoped that the Court of Directors could be induced to consent to the terms of the treaty, (the condition of the auxiliary force alone excluded,) and in this hope, abstained from an acknowledgment which, he believed, would weaken the authority of his government. But in this he was entirely mistaken. Every new letter from England carried out more peremptory instructions than the last for the annulment of the treaty. And there is no doubt that when Lord Dalhousie, at the commencement of the present year, took his measures for the annexation of Oude to the British territories, he found the treaty of 1801 existing in unimpaired force.

But, in the meanwhile, the fallaciousness of the hopes, upon which the Home authorities had based their determination not to supersede that treaty, had been painfully demonstrated. There was a change of rulers; but no change of system. The new king—*capax imperii nisi imperasset*—was found to be, as far as the practical duties of his station were concerned, scarcely more capable of governing than his predecessor. He was old, and he had one of the besetting infirmities of age—love of money. He cared for little so long as the royal treasury was full to overflowing. So the country profited nothing under his rule; and when, in 1842, he was gathered to his fathers, and his son ascended the throne, still there was a change of men, but no change of measures; and the last state of Oude was worse than the first. The reign of this man lasted five years; they were years pregnant with great events; and the English Government, distracted by foreign wars, had little leisure and freedom of thought to bestow upon the affairs of Oude. But, in 1847, peace seemed once more to be smiling on India. There was something in the number *seven* fatal to the sovereigns of Oude. In 1827, died Nussur-oo-deen; in 1837, Nussur-oo-doolah; and in 1847, Umjid Ali Shah. In the February of the last-named, Wajid Ali Shah, then a young man, ascended the throne

There was nothing hopeful in this change. Two years before his accession, Captain Shakespear, who was then officiating as Resident, had written,—“The prospect which the present reign offers is a truly melancholy one, and in case of anything happening to the King, I should much dread that the future will become more clouded. The heir-apparent’s character holds out no prospect of good. By all accounts his temper is capricious and fickle. His days and nights are passed in the female apartments, and he appears wholly to have resigned himself to debauchery, dissipation, and low pursuits.”

With larger means of indulgence the king was, of course, worse than the prince. He more than fulfilled the promise of his youth. He was not, in respect of natural capacity, less incompetent than his predecessors; but he surpassed them all in the extent and variety of his licentiousness. The country was left engulfed in ruin, without an effort to extricate it. But before the end of the first year of the young king’s reign, that wise and benevolent statesman, Lord Hardinge, visited Lucknow. The same strong sense of the paramount duty of the British Government, to interfere for the suppression of this gigantic iniquity, as had forced itself on the mind of Lord William Bentinck, now impressed Lord Hardinge, who solemnly warned the King, that if before the end of two years from that time, no amelioration were apparent in the condition of the country, the British Government would consider it its bounden duty to interfere peremptorily and absolutely for the introduction of a system of government calculated to restore order and prosperity to the kingdom of Oude. There was nothing vague or ambiguous in these expressions. Two years of probation were allowed to the King. He knew the penalty of failure. He knew that if he continued to run the old course of the kings of Oude, he would be forcibly deprived of the power of inflicting further injury on his unhappy people. The remonstrance of the Governor-General was read aloud to him at a conference, and a written copy of it afterwards presented to him. It stated that in 1834, the Court of Directors had given the Governor-General discretionary power to set aside the authority of the King, and to assume the administration of the country, and that unless some beneficial changes were apparent, during the two years of probation granted to the King, this discretionary power would be acted upon. A general outline of the means, by which he might reform his administration, was laid down in this memorandum, and it was added that, if his Majesty cordially entered into the plan, he might have the satisfaction, within the specified period of two years, of checking and eradicating the worst abuses, and, at the same time, of maintaining his own authority and the native institutions of his kingdom unimpaired—but that if he

did not, or if he took a vacillating course, he must be prepared for the other alternative and its consequences. It would then be manifest to the whole world that his Majesty had received a friendly and a timely warning. The King, who was much affected, essayed in vain to speak; so he took up a sheet of paper, and wrote upon it that he thanked the Governor-General, and that he would regard his counsels as though they had been addressed by a father to his son.

What effect the warning had on Wajid Ali Shah is well known. A book, bearing the title of "*The Private Life of an Eastern King*," has been published in England, and by its startling revelations and piquant details, achieved for itself a wide circulation. It is right, however, to state, that the book is not altogether a genuine book. It is not written, as it at first purported to be, by an actual participator in the extraordinary scenes it describes—but by a mere experienced *littérateur* working up the notes supplied to him by one who was an eye-witness of, and to some extent a sharer in the eccentricities of the Court of Lucknow. We have no reason, however, to think that Mr. Knighton has exaggerated the statements which he found in the memoranda placed at his disposal. They, who know best what are the traditions of the palace of Lucknow, are of opinion that many worse stories might be told than any to be found in that book. Indeed, we have heard ourselves, from sufficient authority, incidents of royal pastime, such as no book could detail—incidents of common occurrence at the court of Oude, of such inconceivable grossness and depravity that the European mind is fairly staggered by their recital. But mere personal depravity is no warrant for the deposition of a king. If it were, some European monarchs ere now might have forfeited their crowns by reason of the licentiousness of their lives.

But in such a kingdom, and under such a government as that of Oude, the private and public characters of the King are indissolubly blended. When Caligula turned his horse into a prime minister, the act could hardly with justice have been described as a mere personal weakness; but it was a comparatively harmless eccentricity beside those of the young King of Oude, who allowed fiddlers and dancers, singing men and eunuchs, to usurp the government of the state, to paralyze the efforts of the minister, and even to attempt his assassination. The evil influence of these vile parasites and pandars was felt more or less throughout all conditions of society and in all parts of the country. The licentiousness of the King became, therefore, not a private abomination, but a public calamity. Sunk in measureless debauchery, all affairs of state were utterly neglected. The young King, in spite of the warnings he had received, and the promises he had given, pushed aside business as an insupport-

able nuisance, and went in search of new pleasures. So the two years of probation passed away, and the British Resident reported, "The King has not, since the Governor-General's visit in October 1847, shown any signs of being fully aware of the responsibility he incurs; in fact, I do not think that his Majesty can ever be brought to feel the responsibilities of sovereignty strongly enough to be induced to bear that portion of the burden of its duties that must necessarily devolve upon him; he will always confide it to the worthless minions who are kept for his amusements, and enjoy exclusively his society and his confidence."

The time had now arrived when the British Government might have righteously assumed the administration of Oude. The King had justly incurred the penalty, but the paramount power was in no haste to inflict it. There was, doubtless, considerable reluctance on our part to resort to so extreme a measure; but the tardiness with which the Indian Government proceeded to regard, solemnly and deliberately, the responsibility it incurred by permitting the continued and seemingly incurable misgovernment of Oude, must be attributed in part to the pressure of other great and importunate public business, which then well-nigh overwhelmed Lord Dalhousie and his colleagues. But it was felt by every one, who knew and pondered over the wretched state of the country, that the day of reckoning was approaching, and that the British Government could not much longer shrink from the performance of a duty imposed upon it by every consideration of humanity.

In the meanwhile the disorganization of the government and the sufferings of the people were increasing. Colonel Sleeman was then Resident at Lucknow. He was a man of a liberal and humane nature—thoroughly acquainted with the character and feelings, the institutions and usages of the people of India. No man had a larger toleration for the shortcomings of native governments. But he sympathized at the same time acutely with the sufferings of the subjects of these governments; and his sympathy overcame his toleration. He did not suffer that toleration to merge into weakness or prejudice. He had lived all his adult life in India—the greater part of it in, or on the borders of the Native States; and he was destitute of all overweening prepossessions in favour of European institutions and the "blessings of British rule." But the more he saw, on the spot, of the terrible effects of the misgovernment of Oude, the more convinced he was of the paramount duty of the British Government to step in and arrest the atrocities which were converting one of the finest provinces of India into a moral pest-house. In 1849 and 1850, he made a tour through the interior of the country. He carried with him the prestige of a name, second to none in

India, as that of a friend of the people—a redresser of wrongs, a protector of the weak. He had a manner that inspired confidence; he could not only converse freely and familiarly in the native languages, but, knowing the people well, he had the art of extracting from every man the information which he was most capable of affording. During this tour in the interior, he noted down, from day to day, all the most striking facts which were brought to his notice, with the reflections which were suggested by them. A review of this Diary, which has been privately printed, would be a deeply interesting article in itself. There are several allusions to, and extracts from it, in the Parliamentary Papers relating to Oude; but they afford an inadequate idea of the extent and variety of its illustrations of native misrule. In such an Article as this it is wholly impossible to do more than cite one or two illustrative examples of the oppression which was everywhere exercised by the strong over the weak. In the absence of all controlling authority—of the protection, which it is the first duty of every government to afford to all classes of its subjects—the strong carried on everywhere a war of extermination against the weak. Powerful families, waxing gross on outrage and rapine, built forts, collected followers, and pillaged and murdered in every direction. Let us first see what is the general character of the great landholders, as represented by Colonel Sleeman:—

“The Talookdars keep the country in a perpetual state of disturbance, and render life, property, and industry, everywhere insecure. Whenever they quarrel with each other, or with the local authorities of the government, from whatever cause, they take to indiscriminate plunder and murder—over all lands not held by men of the same class—no road, town, village, or hamlet, is secure from their merciless attacks—robbery and murder become their diversion, their sport, and they think no more of taking the lives of men, women, and children, who never offended them, than those of deer and wild hogs. They not only rob and murder, but seize, confine, and torture all whom they seize, and suppose to have money or credit, till they ransom themselves with all they have, or can beg or borrow. Hardly a day has passed since I left Lucknow, in which I have not had abundant proof of numerous atrocities of this kind committed by landholders within the district through which I was passing, year by year, up to the present day.”

In another part of his *Diary*, Colonel Sleeman speaks of the rise and progress of certain powerful families in Oude, and the means by which they have obtained wealth and influence. What a reign of terror is indicated in the following passage:—

“As the family increased in numbers, it has gone on adding to its possessions in the same manner, by attacking and plundering villages, murdering or driving off the old proprietors of the lands, and taking

possession of them for themselves. Each branch of the family, as it separates from the parent stock, builds for itself a fort in one or other of the villages which belongs to its share of the acquired lands. In this fort the head of each branch of the family resides with his armed followers, and sallies forth to plunder the country and acquire new possessions. In small enterprises, each branch acts by itself. In larger ones, two or more branches unite, and divide the lands or booty they acquire by amicable arrangement. They seize all the respectable whom they find in the villages, which they attack and plunder—keep them in prison, and inflict all manner of tortures upon them, till they have paid or pledged themselves to pay, all that they have or can borrow from their friends as ransom. If they refuse to pay, or to pledge themselves to pay the sum demanded, they murder them. If they pay part, and pledge themselves to pay the rest within a certain time, they are released; and if they fail to fulfil their engagements, they and their families are murdered in a second attack."

We have cited this, in confirmation of several detailed incidents which are given in Colonel Sleeman's *Diary*, in preference to any of the individual atrocities which are plentifully narrated in it, because it indicates a state of society which could only exist under a Government utterly and hopelessly corrupt. Indeed, Colonel Sleeman says,—“It is worthy of remark that these great landholders, who have recently acquired their possessions by the plunder and the murder of their weaker neighbours, and who continue their system of plunder, in order to acquire the means to maintain their gangs, and add to their possessions, are those who are most favoured at Court, and most conciliated by the local rulers; because they are more able and more willing than others to pay for the favour of the one, and set at defiance the authority of the other.” There was hardly an atrocity committed from one end of the country to the other that did not directly result from the profligacy and corruption of the Court.

We have no wish to harrow the feelings of our readers with a recital of the atrocities which had long become familiar to the people of Oude. One brief extract from Colonel Sleeman's *Diary* will suffice. We need only premise that it contains page after page of the same matter :—

“Bhooree Khan then ordered one of his followers, Mirdac, to take Surafaz to a tank outside the village and cut off his nose. He took out at the same time Bukhawur, a Brahmin, and cut off his nose first. Mirdac then ordered a chumar, of Deagow, to cut off the nose of Surafaz, and, standing over him with a sword, told him to cut it deep into the bone. Surafaz prayed hard for mercy, first to Bhooree Khan, and then to Mirdac, but his prayers were equally disregarded by both. The chumar cut off his nose with a rude instrument into the bone, with all his upper lip. He was then let go, but he fell down, after going a little distance, from pain and loss of blood, and

was there found by his uncle, Bulked Khan, who had gone in search of him. He was taken home, but died the same night."

What the effect of all this tyranny and oppression is upon the material resources of the country may be easily conjectured. Many vast tracts of country, which might be a garden, are, in reality, a jungle. Indeed, the magnates of Oude have a direct interest in the maintenance of the wilderness. There are many such entries as the following in Colonel Sleeman's *Diary* :—

"January 23, 1850.—Behta, ten miles, over a plain of fine muhtear soil. The greater part of the surface is, however, covered by a low palus cover. The jungle remains, because no one will venture to lay out his capital in rooting up the trees and shrubs, and bringing the lands under culture, where the fruits of his own industry and his own life and those of his family would be so very insecure; and because the powerful landholders around require the jungles to run to, when in arms against the Government officers, as they commonly are. The land under this jungle is as rich in natural powers as that in tillage; and nothing can be finer than the crops are in the cultivated parts, particularly in those immediately around villages. There are numerous large trees in the jungles; but the fine peepul and banyan trees are torn to pieces for the use of the elephants and camels of the establishments of the local officers, and for the cows, bullocks, and buffalos of the peasantry. . . . No respectable dwelling-house is anywhere to be seen; and the most substantial landholders live in wretched mud hovels, with invisible covers. I asked the people why, and was told, that they were always too insecure, to lay out anything in improving their dwelling-houses; and, besides, did not like to have such local ties, where they were so liable to be driven away by the Government officers, or by the landholders in arms against them, and their reckless followers."

Such was the condition of Oude, when Colonel Sleeman was Resident. After long years of arduous and honourable service, he was compelled to retire, in broken health, from his post,\* and in 1851, he was succeeded by another officer, whose name will ever occupy a distinguished place in the history of our British empire in the East. Colonel James Outram became Resident at Lucknow. A man of humane and generous nature, but of high courage, energy, and firmness, he was appointed to represent the British Government at the Court of Lucknow, in a conjuncture as trying as any in which an Indian diplomatist has ever been called upon to act. To Outram, who had "ever advocated the maintenance of the few remaining native states in India, so long as they retained a principle of vitality, and we could uphold them consistently with our duty as the paramount power, the task imposed upon him was peculiarly painful." He

---

\* He died, we regret to add, on his homeward voyage, in the early part of the present year.

was instructed to inquire into and report upon the condition of the country, with a view to the determination of the long-pending question of the assumption of the Oude Government. A long and able report upon the condition of the country, its government, its establishments, its revenues and resources, &c., was, accordingly, forwarded to the Governor-General in Council, at the close of which the Resident summed up the great catalogue of evil, and declared his conviction, that "the lamentable condition of the country has been caused by the very culpable apathy and gross misrule of the Sovereign and his Durbar." "I have shewn," he added, "that the affairs of Oude still continue in the same state, if not worse—in which Colonel Sleeman from time to time described them to be and that the improvement which Lord Hardinge peremptorily demanded, seven years ago, at the hands of the King, in pursuance of the treaty of 1801, has not, in any degree, been effected. And I have no hesitation in declaring my opinion, therefore, that the duty imposed on the British Government by that treaty, cannot, any longer, admit of our 'honestly indulging the reluctance which the Government of India has felt heretofore, to have recourse to those extreme measures which alone can be of any real efficiency in remedying the evils from which the state of Oude has suffered so long.'"<sup>\*</sup>

\* The following tabular statement, which is to be found in General Outram's Report, indicates more clearly than anything else the disorder of the country. It is to be borne in mind that the population of Oude amounts to from four to five millions.

*Abstract of Crime perpetrated in Oude from A.D. 1848 to 1854 inclusive.*

DATE.	Dacoites.	Persons Killed.	Persons Wounded.	Persons Killed and Wounded (not separately specified)	Total Killed and Wounded.	Villages Burnt and Plundered.	Persons Forcibly Carried off.	Suttees.	REMARKS.
1848, .	149	318	336	655	1,337	36	206	6	N.B.—Wherever in the Diary the word "several" is introduced, as "several murders committed in the country," they have been calculated in these Abstracts at two always.
1849, .	222	798	948	126	1,872	86	150	6	
1850, .	74	504	427	70	1,001	32	42	3	
1851, .	158	654	622	170	1,448	69	99	7	
1852, .	112	796	993	222	2,011	108	146	10	
1853, .	104	755	668	531	1,954	88	391	9	
1854, .	212	544	561	286	1,391	128	454	3	
Total of Seven Years, .	1,031	4,399	4,555	2,060	11,014	547	1,493	44	
Average per annum, .	147½	628½	650½	294½	1,573½	78½	213½	6½	

The day of reckoning had now arrived. After seven years, distinguished by a succession of great events, the brilliant administration of Lord Dalhousie was drawing to a close. Climate, toil, sorrow had broken his health and shattered his frame—but the energies of his mind were undiminished. Without any failure of duty, without any imputation on his zeal, he might have left to his successor the ungrateful task of turning into stern realities the oft-repeated menaces of the Governor-General who had gone before him. But he was not one to shrink from the performance of such a task, because it was a painful and unpopular one. He believed, that by no one could the duty of bringing the Oude Government to solemn account be so fitly discharged as by one who had watched, for seven years, the accumulation of its offences, and seen the measure of its guilt filled to the brim. He intimated, therefore, to the Court of Directors of the East India Company, his willingness to remain in India, to carry out a measure, of a decided and a lasting character, conferring on the long-suffering people of Oude a system of government, under which life and property might be secured, and the resources of the country fairly developed.

In a long and able minute, Lord Dalhousie reviewed the past history of our connexion with Oude—the progressive disorders of the country—the repeated warnings given to its rulers—and the continued disregard with which they had been received. He said that the time had long since arrived for the paramount power to do its duty towards a country whose princes had so shamefully neglected theirs; that, as neither warnings nor threats had availed, and even the proceedings of Lord Hardinge, who had allowed to the young king two years of probation, which, under the force of circumstances, had been extended to eight, had failed to produce any effect on that besotted prince's mind, there was no course open to the British Government, but an assumption of the administration. There were various modes, he said, in which our interposition might be proposed to the Court of Lucknow; and he briefly stated them as follows:—

“There are various modes in which the interposition of the Supreme Government may be proposed to the Court at Lucknow:—

“1st, The King may be required to abdicate the sovereign powers he has abused, and to consent to the incorporation of Oude with the territories of the British Crown.

“2d, The King may be permitted to retain his Royal title and position, but may be required to vest the whole civil and military administration of his kingdom in the Government of the East India Company, for ever.

“3d, His Majesty may be urged to make over his dominions to the management of British officers for a time.

"4th, The King may be invited to place the management of the country in the hands of the Resident; under whose directions it shall be carried on by the officers of the King, acting with such British officers as may be appointed to aid them."

Of these propositions, the second was the one which Lord Dalhousie recommended to the consideration of the Court of Directors. He said, that in consideration of the admitted fact, that the rulers of Oude had always been faithful to the British Government, justice and gratitude required that we should lower the dignity and authority of the sovereigns of Oude no further than was absolutely necessary for the accomplishment of our righteous ends. "The reform of the administration," he added, "may be wrought, and the prosperity of the people may be secured, without resorting to so extreme a measure as the annexation of the territory, and the abolition of the throne. I, for my part, therefore, do not advise that the province of Oude should be declared to be British territory."

Against all temporary measures, and against the attempt to establish a system of double-government, which would be well-nigh certain to fail, Lord Dalhousie protested, and fell back upon the second proposition. It is exceedingly like the first. A king, when he makes over the whole civil and military administration of his kingdom to another governing authority, practically abdicates all sovereign power; and it little matters to him when he is reduced to the state of a mere phantom of royalty, whether the kingdom which he once governed remains an integral territory or a component part of some other empire. The practical effect of the isolation concerns rather the actual than the deposed ruler. "It is my earnest counsel," wrote Lord Dalhousie, "that while the King should be permitted to retain his royal title and rank, he should be required to vest the whole civil and military administration of Oude in the hands of the Company, and that its power should be perpetual in duration, as well as ample in extent." It was proposed, at the same time, that the revenues of the country should be applied, first, to the payment of the expenses of the civil and military administration of the province; secondly, to the payment of stipends to the King and the royal family; and, thirdly, to the improvement and benefit of the province—the residue, if any, to lie at the disposal of the East India Company. Such being the terms proposed, it could little matter to the King whether Oude were incorporated with the British territories, or left an isolated province, with a separate financial budget and a distinct code of laws of its own. Such isolation, we have said, was more the concern of the incoming than the outgoing rulers, for nothing practically could be more complete than the contemplated deposition

of the King. The country, after such deposition, could not be said to be his; and when it ceased to be his, it would surely become the Company's.

Whether, however, there was a difference between the two propositions, or a distinction without a difference, very little matters. All the members of the Supreme Council of India concurred in opinion with the Governor-General, that any further reluctance to interfere peremptorily for the assumption of the government of Oude would be culpable in the extreme. Mr. Dorin and Mr. Grant expressed themselves more strongly on the subject than Lord Dalhousie, and were less inclined to take a favourable view of the position of the royal family. The former was of opinion that as the King had disgraced his royal title, it was unbecoming in the British Government to perpetuate or even to continue it in so unworthy a line.

The minutes of the several members of Government were transmitted, in due course, to the Court of Directors of the East India Company. We have shewn, that in 1834, the Company, on the recommendation of Lord William Bentinck, were prepared to sanction a measure for the temporary assumption of the Government of Oude; but with an honest reluctance to extinguish, even for a time, the sovereign power of a faithful ally, they were glad to avail themselves of any colourable pretext for deferring the day of arbitrary interference, and gave a new king a fair opportunity of inaugurating a new system of government. Since 1834, not one, but three new kings had been placed upon the musnud, only to demonstrate to a just and humane Government that further hope would be folly, and further forbearance a crime. So eager, indeed, had the Company been to give "a fair trial" to the native princes of Oude, that they had authoritatively abrogated the treaty of 1837, which stipulated for the employment of European agency in the internal administration of the country, and had expressed themselves strongly in favour of the maintenance of the existing Native States of India. But twenty more years of misrule and anarchy had raised in their minds a feeling of wondering self-reproach at the thought of their own patience; and when they responded to the reference from Calcutta, they said, that the doubt raised by a survey of the facts before them was not whether it was then incumbent on them to free themselves from the responsibility of upholding such a government, but whether they had been excusable in not fulfilling that duty at an earlier period.

The Court of Directors, therefore, consented to the recommendations of the Governor-General, but with one reservation respecting the *modus operandi*. Lord Dalhousie had expressed a lively hope that the king would be a consenting party to the

arrangement, under the prescribed conditions, for the transfer of the administration of Oude to the hands of the British Government, but had suggested, that if compliance were refused in the first instance, it could be eventually enforced by the withdrawal of the Resident and the British troops, or, in other words, the sole support and protection of the Oude Government. But this measure which, a quarter of a century before, had been recommended, in the case of an extreme emergency, by Sir Charles Metcalfe, had always been opposed by the Court of Directors. In 1834, when a variety of different schemes were under consideration, they had peremptorily rejected this as one scarcely worthy of a moment's consideration.\* And now, again, in 1855, fortified by the strongly expressed opinions of Lord Dalhousie's colleagues, they declared against such an alternative, on the ground that it would bring "the most terrible evils, at least temporarily, on the people of Oude, whose benefit is the sole motive as well as the sole justification of the proposed measure." Rejecting, therefore, this means of reducing the king to such a state of danger and helplessness, as might render him the willing recipient of any terms offered to him, the Court of Directors declared themselves "fully prepared to take the responsibility of authorizing and enjoining the only other course by which their duties to the people of Oude could be fulfilled, that of authoritatively assuming the powers necessary for the permanent establishment of good government throughout the country, leaving all questions of detail to the wisdom of the Governor-General, in conjunction with the other members of your Government."

The letter of the Court of Directors was dated on the 19th of November 1855. A few days later it was despatched to India, and early in January reached Lord Dalhousie at Calcutta. Relying on the consent of the Court, the Governor-General had already well considered and prepared all the details of the great measure with which he was about to close his eventful administration. He had reflected not only on the instructions which it would be necessary to issue to the Resident, relative to the proposals which were to be made to the king, but on the organization of the internal government which we were about to introduce, and the agency it would be expedient to employ. The system of administration was very closely to resemble that which had been tried with such good success in the Punjab. The European agency was to consist, as in that province, of a mixed body of civil and military officers. When

---

\* "The simplest course which presented itself," wrote the Court, in 1834, "that of withdrawing our troops, and leaving the country to its fate, would be pregnant with such evils to the country itself, and with such dangers to our own neighbouring provinces, as to render all discussion of it superfluous."

the final orders from the Home authorities arrived, Lord Dalhousie had not only mapped out his plan of operations, but he had chosen his men. The muster-roll of the new administration was ready; and the machinery was complete.

The despatch of the Court of Directors was read by the Governor-General at midnight, on the 21 of January 1856. Next morning he summoned his Council. The letter of the Court was laid before it, and it was resolved that immediate instructions should be issued to the Resident. It was to be announced to the King that the treaty of 1801 had ceased to exist, and a new treaty, by which he was to make over the administration of Oude in perpetuity to the English, was to be offered for his acceptance. Though still adhering to his original opinion, that the withdrawal of our Resident and troops from Oude would, in the event of the King's refusal to sign the new treaty, be a justifiable and expedient measure, Lord Dalhousie, in compliance with the wishes of the Court of Directors, rejected this alternative, and instructed the Resident to announce that if the treaty were not signed within two days from the date of its presentation, the administration of the country would be forcibly assumed, and the territories of Oude proclaimed to be a portion of our British possessions. But although it was necessary thus to act with decision, under the certainty that, after the common Oriental fashion there would be appeals for further delays and new trials, the Resident was instructed—and we may be sure that such a man as Sir James Outram, following his own unaided instincts, would have shaped his measures in the kindest and most considerate manner—to proceed with the greatest possible regard for the feelings of the King, consistent with the due execution of what had become an imperative duty. But the *fiat* had gone forth. No protests—no remonstrances—no promises—no prayers—could arrest the retributive measure. It need scarcely be added, that no resistance could avert it. A body of British troops, sufficient to put down all possible opposition, had been moved up to the neighbourhood of Lucknow; and for the doomed government of Oude to have attempted to save itself by a display of force would only have been to have courted a useless butchery.

Outram's first communications were with the minister, to whom he imparted the instructions he had received from the Governor-General. He said that his orders were final—that nothing could shake the resolution of the British Government, but that every respect would be shewn to the King, and every provision made for his comfort. It was announced that the Governor-General was anxious to obtain the consent of the King to the proposed measure—but that no refusal on his

Majesty's part could prevent or delay its execution. All this was duly communicated to the King; and at a second conference the minister stated that his royal master was but the servant of the British Government, and that however much he might be afflicted by their demands, he was utterly powerless to resist them. The Resident then announced that a pecuniary provision would be made for the King to the extent of twelve lakhs of rupees (£120,000) per annum, with three lakhs (£30,000) for the maintenance of his palace guards; but that if the treaty to be substituted for that of 1801, which had been so continually violated, were not signed within three days, the provision would be less liberal. In conclusion, the Resident requested the minister to obtain for him, at the earliest possible hour, a personal interview with the King.

The audience was not immediately granted. After the usual fashion of Oriental princes, the King wrote a letter full of flowery falsehoods, expressing his surprise that the British Government, which had always been his friend, should suddenly turn against him and become his enemy. Such protests were utterly useless. No less useless was the next effort to obtain a postponement of the sentence. The Queen-mother, a woman of masculine energy, whose influence over the King was great, sought and obtained an interview with Outram. She asked what her son had done to incur the resentment of the British Government, and to call down on himself so grievous a punishment. She implored the Resident to plead for some further delay, that the King by instituting new reforms might regain the confidence of the British Government. But all Outram could answer was that the time for forbearance was past—that his instructions were final—and that if the Queen really desired to serve her son she would persuade him to accept the liberal conditions offered to him by the Governor-General.

On the 4th of February, the King announced his willingness to receive the British Resident; and Outram, accompanied by Captains Hayes and Weston, proceeded to the palace. Strange and significant symptoms greeted them as they went. They saw that the guns at the palace gates were dismounted. The palace guards were unarmed. The guard of honour, who should have presented arms to the Resident, saluted him only with their hands. Attended by his brother and a few of his confidential ministers, the king received the English gentlemen at the usual spot; and after the wonted ceremonies, the business commenced. Outram presented to the King a letter from the Governor-General, stating the circumstances which had compelled him to adopt the course determined upon, and exhorting his Majesty on his own account and that of his family, not to

resist the unalterable resolution of the British Government. A draft of the proposed treaty was also presented to him. The King received it with a passionate burst of grief, declared that treaties were only between equals; that there was no need for him to sign it, as the British Government would do with him and his possessions as they pleased; they had taken his honour and his country, and he would not ask them for a maintenance. All that he sought was permission to proceed to England, and cast himself and his sorrows at the foot of the throne. Nothing could move him from his resolution not to sign the treaty. He uncovered himself; placed his turban in the hands of the Resident, and sorrowfully declared that title, rank, honour, everything were gone; and that now the British Government which had made his grandfather a King, might consign him to utter obscurity.

In this exaggerated display of helplessness, perhaps, there was something too characteristically oriental, for us to assign any part of it to European prompting. But if the scene had been got up expressly for an English audience it could not have been more cunningly contrived to increase the appearance of harshness and cruelty with which the friends of the King would invest the act of dethronement. No man was more likely than Outram to have been doubly pained, in the midst of all his painful duties, by the unmanly prostration of the King. To deal harshly with one, who declares himself so feeble and defenceless, is like striking a woman or a cripple. But five millions of people are not to be given up, from generation to generation, to suffering and sorrow, because an effeminate prince, when told that he is no longer to have the power of inflicting measureless wrongs on his country, bursts into tears, and says that he is a miserable wretch. We do not doubt that this display of helplessness will be turned to account—but we confess that we should have had much more compassion for the ex-king, in his present misfortunes, if, instead of taking off his turban, he had taken out his sword.

But no passionate outburst of sorrow—no tears or entreaties—can move a British officer who has instructions from his Government to perform a definite duty. It was Outram's business now to issue a proclamation, which had been drawn up by Lord Dalhousie, declaring the province of Oude to be thenceforth, for ever, a component part of the British Indian Empire. The proclamation has been published in every newspaper in the kingdom, and is doubtless familiar to the great bulk of our readers. It went forth to the people of Oude; and the people of Oude, without a murmur, accepted their new masters. There were no popular risings. Not a blow was struck in defence of the native

dynasty of Oude. The whole population went over quietly to their new rulers; and the country has ever since been more tranquil than before.

No sooner had the proclamation been issued than we really began to govern. The whole scheme of administration, even to its most minute particulars, was ready, and all the agents appointed to give it effect were at hand. In a masterly letter to General Outram, who was appointed chief commissioner, this scheme of administration was detailed, and intimations were conveyed to him relative to the principles upon which it was based, and the spirit in which it was desired that the instructions of the Supreme Government should be carried out. The system, as we have said, was nearly identical with that which had been so successfully inaugurated in the Punjab. The spirit which was to be infused into it was enlightened, liberal, humane. Oude was now about really to be governed for the benefit of the people. It was announced that it was the desire and the intention of the British Government "to improve and consolidate the popular institutions of the country, by maintaining the village coparceneries, and adapting our proceedings to the predilections of the people, and the local laws to which they are accustomed; to promote the prosperity of the country, and the welfare of the agricultural classes by light and equitable assessments for a fixed term of years; and to expedite the distribution of justice, both civil and criminal, by removing or dispensing with the many unnecessary forms, and the technicalities which encumber the proceedings of the judicial and magisterial offices in the north-western provinces of India, and circumscribe their power for good." Every effort was to be made to develop the resources and to promote the general improvement of the country:—

"It is hoped," wrote the Political Secretary, "that the foregoing paragraphs contain instructions sufficiently comprehensive and detailed to enable you, with the ample and efficient advice and aid which will be at your disposal, to put the civil administration of the province, in all its branches, on a sound and durable footing. In connexion with this subject, it only remains for the Governor-General in Council to remind you that, under the proposed treaty, the British Government engages to make ample provision for the improvement of the country. It will, therefore, be the duty of every officer not only to develop, as much as possible, the resources of the country in agriculture and manufactures, but to record the results of his experience and observation, so that within a short time a body of information may be accumulated which will shew the real value of the province, the occupation of which has been forced upon the Government. Trade should be protected, encouraged, and fostered by every means; attention should be given at an early period to the improvement of existing communications, and the construction of new lines; means

should be taken for the efficient protection of traffic from lawless violence, as well as from unlicensed extortion. The practicability of extending irrigation by means of canals, may form the subject of inquiry and consideration; and the introduction of valuable products may very well claim your early attention. The Governor-General in Council, you may rest assured, will be prepared to encourage all feasible schemes for the improvement of the country, as far as the means available in men and money will permit."

And, in conclusion, the Government wrote to the Chief Commissioner, saying, —

"In intrusting to your hands the entire administration of the affairs of the Province of Oude, the Governor-General in Council is persuaded that no efforts on your part will be wanting to diffuse the blessings of good government, to make our rule popular and acceptable, and to advance the credit of the British name among a people who, by their proximity to our own districts, and their knowledge of the British character, are well able to appreciate our good faith, our moderation, and our justice."

It would be mere waste of time to speculate—though speculation in such a case borders close upon assurance—upon the contrast which the future of Oude is likely to present to the past. No sane man can ever really doubt for a moment that the country will be more prosperous, and the people more happy under our rule, than under that of the native princes. But this, it may be said, is no justification of a measure otherwise unjust. We doubt, however, whether any one, who has followed us thus far in what we have intended to be a plain statement of facts, will regard the annexation of Oude as an unjust measure. Its justification mainly resides in the clear and undeniable right of the British Government to compel the observance of treaties entered into by the native states of India with the paramount power. That the sovereigns of Oude, one after another, continually violated the treaty of 1801, is a fact too often and too clearly demonstrated to need to be repeated here. They violated it in the most culpable and injurious manner; for they broke their engagements with the British Government by breaking faith with their own subjects. They wronged us by wronging them. And they did this knowingly, habitually, perseveringly—in the face of continued remonstrances; in the face of continued threats; in spite of repeated promises and repeated pledges; with the penalty, in its full significance, staring them in the face. They tried the forbearance of the British Government to the utmost; they took advantage of its clemency and its moderation. The more reluctant the paramount power shewed itself to use its giant's strength like a giant, the more grievous became the misgovernment of Oude; the more terrible the oppressions exercised by the people; the more gross

the profligacy of the Court. To this dreadful state of things—to the disorganization of society, to the measureless sufferings of the people, for more than half a century we had administered. We could not be mere neutrals—mere passive spectators of all these iniquities. The British Government was emphatically *particeps criminis*. As long as it maintained a regiment in Oude, it was an agent of oppression—a contributor to the sufferings of the people. The treaty of 1801 compelled us to maintain a British force in Oude; and so long as that treaty was in existence, it was impossible to recede from this obligation. The violation of one part of a treaty does not legalize the violation of another part; but it legalizes the nullification of the whole. We were thoroughly justified in declaring the treaty null. But to have made the declaration, and then to have withdrawn our troops, leaving the country to anarchy and confusion far worse than any it had seen before, and subjecting our own frontier to troubles and disturbances, would have brought the worst calamities for a time on Oude, without in any way securing its independence. To use a homely expression, it would have “come to the same thing in the end.” Oude must have passed eventually under our government. Interposition would have been necessary—in all probability it would have been sought. Better, therefore, to precipitate the inevitable hour; better to assume the administration of Oude before than after a civil war, in the course of which, in all human likelihood, the king himself would have been barbarously slain.

But, after all, the great consideration is, What are the feelings with which the people of Oude contemplate this revolution? It would be a mistake to bring our European notions to bear upon the solution of such a question. In no part of India is there what in the vocabulary of the West is called a *Public*. There are classes, and in proportion as these classes are enlightened, is the strength of their political opinions. ‘But the vast majority have no political opinions. It is not probable that the great bulk of the people of Oude have ever asked themselves the question whether they would be happier under British rule, or under that of their native potentates. There is a very general respect, however, for the British name in all parts of the country. “The British character,” says Colonel Sleeman in his Diary, “is respected in the remotest village and jungle in Oude; and there is, I believe, no part of India, where a European officer is received among the people of all classes with more courtesy and kindness than in Oude. There is certainly no city or town in any other native state in India, where he is treated in the crowded streets with more respect than in Lucknow.”

There is, perhaps, a peculiar reason for this, of which some mention should be made. The native army of the Bengal Presidency has been largely recruited from the Oude provinces. The Company, indeed, have long drawn their best soldiers from the country which they have now absorbed. In every village there are one or more families who derive their means of subsistence from their connexion with the Company. The remittances of an absent member in the prime of life, or the pension drawn by some honest veteran, whose years of service are past, provides the daily meal of the family, and is known to be as certain in its coming as the light of the morning or the dusk of eve. The good faith of the Company's Government is to thousands and tens of thousands a substantial reality. It is felt and appreciated by all classes, from the great capitalists in the city to the poor villager in the remotest nooks and crevices of the country. Colonel Sleeman states that the moneyed men of Lucknow invest largely in Government securities, and that the price of Company's paper ranges higher in Oude than in our own territories. The faith of the public creditor has been shaken at Calcutta, when it has lost none of its steadfastness at Lucknow.

That the name of the British Government, and the character of the British nation, have been held in the highest esteem by the people of Oude, whilst their own Durbar has been hated and despised, is not to be questioned. But it is said that even this does not indicate a desire after British rule. And it is contended that, if the inhabitants of Oude had any very keen sense of the blessings of this rule, as contrasted with the disorder and insecurity of their own country, they would have emigrated from their wretched homes, and sought an asylum in the Company's territories—whereas the fact is, that they have not. The fact we admit: but not the inference. The argument is essentially a European argument, though used by men of Oriental experience. But even in this country, with all our Anglo-Saxon energies, our love of travel, our colonizing propensities, our facilities of locomotion, and, above all, our tendencies to family dispersion, we are slow to leave our old homes. Men hear a great deal before they run away from the evil of which they complain. Even in our common every-day lives how much we bear, as individual men, rather than make the least effort to remove the infliction, though the trouble imposed upon us may be little more than a journey to the next room. In the weightier concerns of life, too, how tolerant we are of evil. We continue to occupy, under no legal or social obligation, an inconvenient house, though we know we may obtain a better and cheaper one in the next street. Our families, who can barely keep body and soul together, continue to live from year's end to year's end

in the same village, though they know that in another part of the country they may obtain food, fuel, and shelter, at half the price. People are swayed by local attachments—or fettered by indolence—or restrained by vague fears of danger—or an unwillingness to cast their lot among strangers. They know the worst of the old place; and they cling to it. But in India all these considerations operate with double force to tie the family to the soil. The people are far more indolent and far more timid. They are more patient and less prone to change. But, above all, they are more gregarious. The social institutions of the country are adverse to extensive emigration. We know little in this country of the wonderful adhesiveness of those communities over which the tempest of revolution passes and leaves as firmly cemented as before. But we can fairly draw no inferences from the fact of the non-emigration of the people of Oude, without taking into account the character, the usages, and the institutions of the people.

The solution of this apparent difficulty has been variously rendered, not only by our own most experienced officers, but by the people themselves. More than thirty years ago, Captain E. Laurence of the Bengal Army, who was then paymaster of family monies in Oude, and who traversed the whole length and breadth of the country, recorded his observations in some very able and interesting papers, which exhibit in the darkest possible lines, the demoralization of the Oude Government, and the disorganization of the country. In one of these papers occurs the following passage :—

“ There is one circumstance connected with the people of Oude, which, though not so evident as to strike the observer at first sight, has, nevertheless, the effect of rendering their sense of wretchedness more acute : this consists in the habit of comparing their condition with that of their neighbours. The following is the substance of what I have heard several intelligent men express in contrasting their lot with the security enjoyed by others :—‘ We are surrounded by people who, little more than twenty years ago, were our fellow-subjects; by some arrangement, the Nawab resigned his power over them, and they became subjects of the Company. We have friends and relations among them, with whom we preserve an occasional intercourse. We see them in the enjoyment of every blessing, and return to our homes with feelings more alive to our own unhappiness. How does it happen that a power which is productive only of good on one side of the border, serves on the other but to aggravate our misery?’ This, it must be confessed, is a singular anomaly. When I have been addressed by people in this strain, I have asked them if they could not obtain shelter and employment in the Company’s provinces; they reply, that it is what thousands have been compelled to do, but that it was always attended with difficulty and

uncertainty, more especially where a whole family has to be removed. 'Besides,' urge they, 'it is only by kicks and blows that you can drive dogs from a village in which they have been whelped, and men are bound to places by stronger ties than dogs. We are attached to the houses in which we were born—to the lands which our forefathers cultivated—and some of us possess a proprietary right in the soil, which we must renounce if we abandon the country. We therefore bear our ills with the hope that in the end the Company will receive us under its protection.\*' Such is the language of truth and feeling in which these people bewail their condition, and I cannot refrain from expressing my perfect conviction, that, among the whole class of cultivators, which comprehends all that is respectable in Oude, there is not a single honest and industrious man who does not earnestly desire to be sheltered under the protection of the British Government. I further believe, that there is not a disorderly or worthless ruffian in the country, who does not as sincerely rejoice in the present order of things."

Some ten years later, another solution of the difficulty was furnished by Colonel Low, who, writing to the Supreme Government, touched upon the emigration question, and said that the unwillingness of the people to cross the border arose, principally, from their ignorant fears of our petty native functionaries:—

"No one," he said, "can dispute that the Oude Government has for the last four years been a bad one, and that in 1838, it was a very oppressive one—yet, neither then nor since, have we heard of any emigration into our provinces. I have several times had conversations with the inhabitants of small villages in Oude—poor cultivators of the soil—on this subject, during journeys which I have made in the country; they complain to me of large portions of their crops being taken in excess of the original assessment, and sometimes of much more violent oppression; but on my asking why, if exposed to such misery, they did not settle in the Company's territory, they uniformly objected to such an expedient. Some gave no distinct reasons; but I well remember the answer of one group near the Vanamoke ghant of the Ganges—'No, no,' said the chief spokesman of the party, 'we have but one tyrant here—the animal—who is bad enough, but in your country there are a hundred masters—every villain of a thanadar or chuprassee is a tyrant over the ryots there.' The above is a gross exaggeration of the inconveniences suffered by ryots in our provinces, and the speech leaves entirely out of sight the advantages of our system, and, above all, the incalculable benefits arising from the integrity and hard labour for the public good of our European functionaries. It is, in fact, an unjust prejudice—but the notion is not the less deeply impressed on the minds of the people; and I have heard similar sen-

---

\* It is by the existence of this hope alone that the country is now preserved from general insurrection.

timents, though not couched in the same terms, expressed by natives of other states in India, which border upon our territories."

One more illustration of the causes which have operated to limit emigration, may be gathered from Sir James Outram's published report:—

"It may naturally be supposed, that the people of Oude, if so greatly oppressed as has been represented, would emigrate to the neighbouring British districts, which it does not appear from the replies I have yet received from the Magistrates, whom I questioned on the subject, that they do to any great extent. The Magistrate of Futtehpore says nothing on this point; while those of Azingurh, Shahjehanpore, and Allahabad, have given no reply at all. The Magistrate of Jounpore is 'not aware that the population of Oude has decreased of late, or that there has been any considerable emigration from Oude into British territory.' The Magistrate of Goruckpore says nothing of emigrants, but that there are from 90 to 100 families who have possessions on both sides of the frontier, who live sometimes in Oude, and sometimes in the Goruckpore district, and who are therefore constructively subjects of both Governments. The Magistrate of Futtehgurh says, the emigration from Oude into his district 'is, he believes, very limited, though, in time of difficulty, many people from Oude take refuge there for a season.' The Magistrate of Cawnpore furnishes a list of emigrants from Oude, 'during the last six or seven years,' amounting to 2333, of whom 1354 are agriculturists, and 1294 non-agriculturists; and states, 'these people have emigrated with their wives and families, and may be regarded as permanently established. The non-agriculturists, perhaps, may be looked upon as birds of passage, but still they are not likely to return to Oude.'

"But the condition of the people of Oude cannot be fairly tested by the extent of emigration; for, as stated by Major Troup, 'although shamefully oppressed, they are much attached to their country.' And it happens that the middling and agricultural classes especially, who otherwise might be driven to emigrate, obtain, indirectly, the protection of the British Government to such an extent as preserves them from the necessity of having recourse to the extreme measure of abandoning their birthright, in the privilege which their relatives in the Company's service enjoy, of petitioning through the Resident, who has thus the means of inquiring into grievances, and demanding redress in their behalf. To acquire this privilege, every agricultural family in Oude, perhaps without exception, besides many of other occupations, sends one of its members into the British army, and thus secures through him the right of claiming the Resident's interference. The number of Oude Sepoys in our service, consequently, who enjoy this privilege, is estimated by Colonel Sleeman at 40,000, and the relatives they represent may probably amount to ten times that number, or nearly one-tenth of the entire population of Oude."

But admitting the fact that emigration from the Oude provinces to our own has been very scanty, and that some such

apprehensions as those stated to Colonel Low may have been among the causes which have induced them to live from generation to generation under their native rulers, without seeking to better their condition by removing themselves to other parts of the country, it by no means follows that they will not hail delightedly a revolution which brings to them a change of masters, without necessitating a change of residence. Colonel Sleeman, indeed, has emphatically declared his opinion that all the classes of the Oude population will "hail the change as a great blessing." The following is no barren statement of opinion. It is supported by reasons drawn from long local experience and knowledge of facts :—

"Such a change would be popular among the members of the royal family itself, who now get their pensions after long intervals—often after two and even three years, and with shameful reductions in behalf of those favourites and parasites whom they detest and despise, but whom the minister, for his own personal purposes, is obliged to conciliate by such perquisites. It would be popular among the educated classes, as opening to them offices now filled by knaves and vagabonds from all parts of India. It would be no less so to the well-disposed portion of the agricultural classes, who would be sure of protection to life, property, and character, without the expensive trains of armed followers which they now keep up. But, to secure this, we should require to provide them with a more simple system of civil judicature than that which we have at work in our old territories.

"The change would be popular, with few exceptions, among all the mercantile and manufacturing classes. It would give vast employment to all the labouring classes throughout the country, in the construction of good roads, bridges, wells, tanks, temples, suracs, military and civil buildings, and other public works; but, above all, in that of private dwellings, and other edifices for use and ornament, in which all men would be proud to lay out their wealth to perpetuate their names, when secured in the possession by an honest and efficient government; but more especially those who would be no longer able to employ their means in maintaining armed bands to resist the local authorities and disturb the peace of the country. On the whole, I think that at least nine-tenths of the people of Oude would hail the change as a great blessing; always providing that our system of administration should be rendered as simple as possible to meet the wants and wishes of a simple people."

The passage is an important one, for it shows wherein lie our just and reasonable hopes that the great revolution, which has brought five millions of new subjects under our rule, will be in effect, whatever it may have been in anticipation, a blessing to the people. The great experiment has been inaugurated, and under the happiest auspices. Nothing can be more bright and cheering than the dawn of the new era. Whilst the wretched

King, surrounded as of old by native parasites, who will cling to him as long as the clink of the gold mohur makes music in their ears, and by a few English mercenaries who are turning him to profitable account, is slowly making up his mind on the banks of the Hooghly, to leave the black water and to proceed to England, or else altogether to abandon the fearful project; our English administrators are pushing forward their good work with unshrinking energy, and rapidly advancing towards a settlement of the country. The confidence of the people in our justice and humanity is perfect. They are full of faith and full of hope. Whilst this sheet has been passing through the press, the highest Indian authority has announced, in his place in Parliament, the complete success of our initial measures, and quoted the following gratifying passage of a letter from the Governor-General, dated on the 3d of May:—

“Oude remains perfectly tranquil. Some of the zemindars holding armed forts have availed themselves of the option given them by General Outram, and have paid part of their arrears in guns, which are taken at a valuation, although nothing in the shape of coercion or threat has been used to make them do so. The ryots continue, as from the beginning, to show the best proof of satisfaction and confidence, by flocking back to tracts of country which were rapidly becoming desert and jungle, owing to the population being driven away, either by oppression practised on themselves, or by the feuds and ravages of the zemindars in the neighbourhood. I have no doubt this confidence will pread and increase with the progress of our three years’ temporary settlement, teaching them, as it will, that their rent henceforward will be fixed and moderate, and that everything they possess beyond that rent will be their own without fear of extortion.”

We do not believe that there is an Englishman so saturated and sodden with prejudice, as really to believe that the people of our Oude will not be happier under our rule than under that of their native princes. Such belief may be affected—it cannot be felt. It is far more likely that the question will set the other way—that people will ask why a country so wretchedly misgoverned under our very eyes was not “annexed” before—far more likely that their thoughts will find adequate exponents in some such words as those uttered by Mr. Seton-Karr in his eloquent speech on the administration of Lord Dalhousie:—

“I turn, lastly, to the country of Oude, which was annexed simply because the misgovernment was such that the Company could not permit it to continue any longer. It is difficult fully and accurately to describe the misrule of that unhappy country. I will only say that bands of robbers overrun the country, and that the landowners are in the habit of suffering whole tracts to run waste, in order that

they may surround themselves with an impenetrable jungle, and set the King's troops at defiance. Life and property are frightfully insecure; and justice is bought with rarity, only because there are few people with any money to buy it, and few things which it is worth their while to buy. I have heard elsewhere comparisons instituted between a native Government and that of the Company; I have heard it doubted whether the Company's rule was at all superior to that of Oude; but I can only say that if the Company's territories on the right bank of the Ganges are misgoverned, then, under such misgovernment, they are duped into wealth and deceived into prosperity; while, if the territories of Oude are well governed, they are well governed under a policy which turns every official into a corrupt and reckless tyrant, every landholder into a rebel arrayed against the Government, every peasant into a skulking fugitive or an armed robber, and which is fast turning every smiling homestead and fertile plain into a desert waste. Yes, Gentlemen, I confidently believe that when that fearful catalogue of anarchy and corruption, of tyranny and of crime, is laid before the public, as I understand it shortly will be—when that record of freaks of royalty, which would be ludicrous did they not involve the happiness of a whole people—of debauchery which it is scarcely possible to speak of in any terms of decency, or in any dialect of civilized man—shall be faithfully put forth, every honest Englishman will rise with the indignant inquiry why such a state of things was so long permitted to continue, under the very eyes of our administrators and in the very heart of our realm?"



# INDEX

TO THE

TWENTY-FIFTH VOLUME OF THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

- Alford's Greek Testament, 110—his task of textual revision, 116.  
 American sympathies with Russia, 269.  
 Athens, *see* Greece.  
 Austria, her policy in seeking to reduce to a minimum the occidental results of the Paris Congress, 262.  
 Biblical Criticism, object of, 111.  
 Brewster's, Miss, "Sunbeams in the Cottage," 218, 253.  
 Britain, its present political duties, 276-280.  
 Buddhist Reformation, 229.  
 Buddhism and Popery, resemblance between, 330.  
 Cabinets, origin of, 103.  
 Carpenter's Treatise on the Microscope criticised, 470.  
 Cavour, Count, his propositions as to Italy at the Paris Congress, 259, 260.  
 Clairvoyance, 114.  
 Coleridge, 422.  
 Congress of Paris, *see* Peace.  
 Crimean Campaign, French misstatements corrected, 493—disasters of the first winter, 494—investigation into their causes, 495—sufferings of the French troops, 495—spirit of French accounts of the conduct of the British, 496, 497—battle of the Alma, 498—specimens of Bazancourt's bombast, 497, 500—St. Arnaud's self-laudation, 501—English and French conflicting statements, 502—refusal of Canrobert to assault Sebastopol, 503—privations and sufferings accounted for, 505—when, and why, it was determined to winter before the town, 506—alleged dependence of the English on the French, 507—unequal partition of siege labours, 509—the English share in the final success, 511—results of the campaign on continental opinion, 513.  
 Criticism, British New Testament, 111—the *textus receptus*, 112—estimate of the researches of the various critics, 111-116—scriptural interpretation, 117, 118—allegorical, sceptical, and historical systems, 119-122—Mr. Ellicott's Commentaries, 123, 124—Dr. Eadie as an expositor, 126—his merits as a scholar, 127—specimens of his expositions, 128-132—Mr. Stanley's Commentaries characterized by their historical tone and method, 133—their picturesque power, 134—admirable summaries, 137—value of his book, 139.  
 Dickens's "Bleak House," 251.  
 Douglas of Cavers on "Britain and the World," 268.  
 Drama, decline of, under the Stuarts, 7—dramatic compositions of Justice Talford, 57-61.  
 Dutch Reformation, 384—first victims, 395.  
 Eadie, Dr., his Commentaries, 125—his description of the work of exposition, 126—his merits as a scholar, 127—a worthy representative of Scottish Biblical scholarship, 127—his volumes characterized by their didactic tone, 130—specimens of his expositions, 128, 130.  
 Ellicott's Commentaries, 122—his task thoroughly accomplished, 123.  
 England, (Macaulay's History of,) *see* Macaulay.  
 Ephesians, Epistle to the, its general object and contents, 128, 129.  
 Erasmus, his influence on his age, 380, 382—propensity for practical jokes, 380—his trimming policy, 383—his Greek Testament, 112.  
 France, literary tendencies in, 349—contrasted with England, 349—radical difference between seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, 350—causes of individual greatness, 351—gold-worship and disorder now characteristic of French immorality, 351—Victor Hugo, &c., 352—what is the life of Art? 353—Idealism, 354—the ideal in Lamartine, 355—difference between Guizot, Villemain, and Cousin, 357—Cousin's self-consistency, 359—his political life, 360—evil

- influence of Chateaubriand, 361—characteristics of the seventeenth century, 363—Cousin's appreciation of the era of Louis XIV., 364—its elevated spirit, its Liberalism, 365—great merit of Cousin's historical biographies, 367—moral greatness superior to every other, 369—Marie de Hantefort, 372, Cousin's sympathies, 373-375.
- Greece, Grote's History of, 141—its merits and demerits, 142, 170-172—its general character, 143—"the boot and the tub," 144—his view of the myths, 145—the Sicilian Greeks, 146—Socrates and the Sophists, 147—Greek "town-autonomy," 149—autonomous superiority of Athens, 150—the Solonian reform, 153—reforms of Kleisthenes and of Aristides, 156—working of the Democracy, 157-160—ostracism, 162—position of demagogues, 163—political and military leaders distinguished, 164—Kleon and Thucydides, 165—the Athenian empire, 167-170.
- Greek Testament, editions of, 111—that of Erasmus the Pharos of the English Reformation, 382.
- Highland life and scenery, as described by Macaulay, 91.
- Hindoo nation, antiquity of, 212—mental characteristics of, 213—the popular religion and legendary poems, 227.
- Hindustan, character of learned classes in, 210.
- Historical Painting, *see* Macaulay.
- Holland, its Martyrs and Heroes, 376—peculiar nature of the country, 376—its very soil a triumph of remarkable industry, 376—a far-travelled territory, 377—rise of the Dutch Republic, 378—Pope Adrian VI. a Dutchman, 379—his epitaph, 379—influence of Erasmus, 380—the merry Hollander, 381—the barbs of Rotterdam, 384—first martyr of the Dutch Reformation, 384—atrocious cruelties of Philip II., 386-391—siege of Leyden, 393—perseverance and prowess, 395—Belgium and Holland contrasted, 396—eminent Dutchmen, 397—character of Mr. Motley's work, 398.
- Homes of the poor, 283—remedial agents, 284—improvement of their dwellings, 285.
- Hume and his critics, 421.
- Hurricanes, origin and nature of, 200.
- India, importance of, as a mission field, 232, *see* Missions.
- Indian Literature, 205—the various aspects of, 209—character of learned classes in Hindustan, 210—usefulness of Sanskrit to civilians, 211—present state of Indian studies, 212—mental characteristics of the Hindus, 213—the four Vedas, 214—Vedic hymns, 215—their character and contents, 216—the Vedic polytheism, 217—rise of Indian speculative philosophy, 219—its various schools, 220—their different theories and fundamental differences, 222, 223—Hindu metaphysics and Christian missionaries, 225—the Buddhist reformation, 229—its signal success, 230—nobler features of Hindumism, 231—importance of India as a field of Christian mission, 232.
- Interpretation, biblical, different systems of, 118.
- Italy the mother-country of dramatic and pictorial art, 10—morality of old Italian novelists, 13—Italy and the congress of Paris, 259.
- Jonson, Ben, his opinion of his fellows, 17—his *Alchemist*, 18.
- Lardner's Treatise on the Microscope noticed, 471.
- Macaulay (T. B.), his qualifications as a historical painter, 79—instances of his inaccuracies and unwarranted deductions, 81-84—indefensible scene painting, 85—his charges against Penn, 86, and Marlborough, 87-92, examined—his "History" as a work of art, 93—extravagance of his descriptions, both of scenery and of characters, 95-95—admirable summaries of arguments, 96-100—the Toleration Act, 101—origin of "Cabinets," 103—masterly delineations of character, 107—charm and merit of style, 109.
- Marlborough, his singular character, 86—Macaulay's treatment of, 87-92.
- Marriage, false views of, entertained by many women, 256—deplorable consequences, 256.
- Microscope, the, and its Revelations, 437—its history, 439—"disputed" invention of compound microscope, 441—Galilee, 441—value of microscope in the extension of science, 442—single microscope, 442—early experiments, 443-445—Leuwenhoeck's single-lens microscope, 445—lenses of water, oils, and varnishes, 446, 447—lenses of precious stones, catadioptric lenses, 448—semilens and sector microscopes, 449—the bottle and fish-eye microscopes, 450—single reflecting microscope, 451—microscopic doublets and triplets, 452—the periscopic microscope, 452—Sir John Herschel's doublet, 453—Wollaston's doublet, 454—the eye microscope with four lenses, 456—the compound microscope, 457—first achromatic microscopes, 457—merit of British opticians, 458—microscopes of various makers, British and foreign, 459, 460—compound reflecting microscope, 461—bino-

- cular and multocular microscopes, 462.—  
illustration of the polarization of light,  
463.—polarizing microscopes, 464.—illu-  
mination of microscopic objects, 465.—  
notices of various works on the micro-  
scope and its revelations, 469-471.—edu-  
cational value and uses of the microscope,  
472.—its future, 475.—imperfections to be  
overcome, 474-476.
- Milton, a Puritan, and the only lasting poet  
of his generation, 39.
- Missions, Christian, 314.—proselytism, 315  
—object of missionary enterprise, 317.—  
obscured by exaggerated language of its  
advocates, Romish and Protestant, 317.—  
corrupting causes, 318.—self-interest, of  
the missionary, 319.—of the converts, 321  
—another corruption, affecting the pro-  
moters of the cause at home, 322.—mixed  
motives of subscribers, 323.—the 19th  
century “street corners,” 323.—evil of  
combining political with religious objects,  
324.—evil of sectarian zeal, 325.—Romish  
missions and missionaries, 326-332.—num-  
ber of Romish converts not known, 333.—  
Moravian missions, 335.—their mission-  
aries chiefly of German origin, 336.—Eng-  
lish Episcopal missions, 337.—colonial  
bishops, 338.—their tendency to despot-  
ism, 339.—extent of Methodist missions,  
340.—literary labours of Baptist mis-  
sionaries, both British and American, 340.—  
London Missionary Society, 341.—Scottish  
missionaries, 341.—effect of the Disruption  
341, 342.—harmony of Protestant mis-  
sions 343.—their various success, 347.—  
the future of missions, 348.
- Netherlands, *see* Holland.
- Novel and novelists, 426.
- Ottoman Empire, 281.—immediate and pro-  
spective results of the Treaty of Paris,  
282.—Russo-Turkish relations during the  
last eighty years, 283.—elements of Turk-  
ish Government, 287.—community of in-  
terest of the different races, 288.—dis-  
union of the Christian populations, 289  
—relation of Ottoman Government to its  
dependent provinces, fourfold, 290.—de-  
clining hostility of Turks and Christians,  
291.—the Ottoman rule the present strong  
basis of Christian liberty, 292.—decline of  
Greece, 293.—neutralization of the Black  
Sea, 295.—the Christian Principalities,  
296.—the new Bessarabian frontier, 297  
—the Asiatic Principalities, 298.—neces-  
sity of a Russian suzerainty over these  
states, 301.—provisions for their commer-  
cial development, 303.—the Danubian  
Principalities, 304.—Moldo-Wallachian  
reform, government and serfdom, 07.—  
concession of civil rights to Christian  
subjects, its preservative policy, 309.—  
decline of religious animosities, 311.—  
commercial progress, 312.
- Oude, annexation of, 515.—what that king-  
dom was previously, 516.—king-making,  
517.—alliance between Oude and Britain,  
517.—the subsidiary system, 519.—pro-  
gressive rule, 520.—disorders of the  
country, 521.—views of the Court of Di-  
rectors, 523.—recommendations of Colonel  
Low, 525.—Lord Auckland's policy, 526  
—Treaty of 1837, 527.—its annulment,  
529.—licentiousness of the kings of Oude,  
530-532.—Colonel Sleeman's Diary, 533  
—its harrowing details, 534, 535.—Colonel  
James Outram, 536.—state of crime, 536  
policy of Lord Dalhousie, 537.—proceed-  
ings of Court of Directors, 539, 540.—  
announcement of their instructions to the  
authorities of Oude, 541.—behaviour of  
the king, 542, 543.—Oude proclaimed a  
British province, 544.—future prospects,  
545.—respect of the natives for the Brit-  
ish character, 546.—their attachment to  
country, 547.—causes of limited emigra-  
tion as expressed by Captain Laurence,  
548, and more recently by Colonel Low,  
549.—views of Sir James Outram on this  
subject, 550.—Colonel Sleeman's opinion  
of the change of government, 551.—pre-  
sent condition of Oude, 551; 552.
- Peace and its political duties, 257.—congress  
of Paris, 258.—results of the Treaty, 261,  
285.—the Italian question, 259.—proposi-  
tions of M. Cavour, 260.—opinions about  
the peace, 263-265.—Montalembert's view  
of the future of Great Britain, 266-268.—  
is Britain likely to weather the storm into  
which she seems drifting? 268.—specula-  
tions of Mr. Douglas of Cavers in his  
“Passing Thoughts,” 268.—the coming  
storm, 269.—where the mischief is brew-  
ing, 270.—the Russian problem unsolved,  
271.—the “nationalities,” 272.—prospects  
of France, 273.—signs in the ecclesiastical  
world, 275.—the duties devolving on Bri-  
tain, 276-280.
- Perthes, Frederick, Memoirs of, 447.—its  
literary, religious, and political interest,  
476.—sent to Leipzig as an apprentice to  
the book-trade, 478.—removal to Ham-  
burgh, 478.—high-toned ideal of his voca-  
tion, 479.—his energetic character, 479.—  
period of French domination, 481.—his  
flight from Hamburgh, and subsequent  
return, 482.—removal to Gotha, 483.—  
description of Gotha, 484.—Perthes' his-  
torical and theological publications, 485;  
486.—his intercourse with celebrated men,  
486.—Niebuhr and Schlegel, 487, 488.—  
interview with Jean Paul Richter, 489.—  
peculiar charm of Perthes' religious life,  
490.—his last days, 491.
- Phenomena of Magnetism, 203.

Plays and Puritans. *See* Puritans.

Playhouses, old, nests of profligacy, 15.

Poetry, British, during the last hundred years, 426-434.

Priestley, Dr., anecdote of, 414.

Puritans *versus* Players, 5—common notions on the point, 5—Mr. Gifford's view contradicted by history, 7—Puritans the first to attack, 8—staple subject of old comedies, 9—tragedies of 17th century; Ben Jonson's opinion, 17—his caricature of the Puritans, 18—his *Alchemist*, 19—apotheosis of rakes, 23—Shakspeare's plays, 24—himself underrated by his fellows, 25—Massinger's *Virginia Martyr*, 27—Webster's masterpieces, 28—Shirley criticised, 31-31—Cartwright a hater of Puritans, 36—his unfulfilled prophecies, 37—Milton a Puritan, 38—the only lasting poet of his generation, 39—the poetry of Puritanism, 43-46.

Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 415.

Rogers, Samuel, and his Times, 399—political history of his early years, 401—his first appearance as an author, 403—reminiscences of public men, 406—of little historical use, 408—his politics, 409—"the blue and yellow," 410—industrial history of his times, 411—agriculture, locomotion, steam-engine, electric telegraph, &c., 411—manufacturing industry, machinery, 412—extraordinary advance of science in his times, 413—references to this in his *Table-talk* very slight, 414—his interest in the fine arts, 415—music, painting, sculpture, architecture, 415—reminiscences of artists, 416, 417—the philosophy of Rogers's times, 419—his little metaphysics, 420—reminiscences of philosophers, 421—Hume and his critics, 421—Coleridge's talk, 422—historical writers of Rogers's times, 423—prose imaginative literature, 424—decline of dramatic literature, 425—rise and development of the British novel, 426—the poetry of his times, 427-429—reminiscences of poets, 430-432—the present period of British poetry characterized (1.) by a spirit of literary pre-Drydenism, 433; and (2.) by a spirit of subjectivity, 434—estimate of Rogers as a poet, 435.

Romanism and Buddhism, resemblance between, 330.

Russia and the Peace, 270—the real Russian question not yet settled, 270, 271.

Sanskrit literature, 208—usefulness of, to civilians, 211.

Shakspeare's plays, a heritage for all ages, 24. Stanley's Commentaries, their historical tone, 132—specimens of his exposition, 136-140.

Storms, on the law of, 201—rotatory and progressive, 201—magnetic storms, 179.

Talfourd's (Mr. Justice) "Life and Writings," 47—qualifications for the bar, 49—professional progress and promotion to the coif, 53—chosen to represent his native town in Parliament, 54—infant ens-tody and copyright Acts, 55—his first drama, "Ion," 57—its merits and demerits, 59—drama of "Glencoe," 61-63—raised to the Bench, 56—his parliamentary and forensic speeches, 67-69—his continental travels, 72—taste in Art, 73—his legal knowledge and judicial merits, 77—his death, 56.

Taste, Puritan canons of, accepted now—days, 41.

Toleration Act, 101.

Tregelles, Dr., his labours as a Biblical critic, 116.

Turkey, *see* Ottoman empire.

Weather and its prognostics, 173—a subject of hourly interest, 174; registers of, in Scotland, 175—establishment of physical observatories, 177—Russian and French observatories, 178—discussion in French Academy of Sciences, 180, 181—violent sortie of M. Biot, 182—meteorological observatory at Algiers, 186—laws of atmospheric density and pressure, 189—distribution of temperature, 191—periodical rotation of climate, 192—curves of hourly temperature, 193—method of obtaining mean temperature, 194—monthly and daily hourly curves, 195—the "critical interval," 196—temperature of the earth, 197—rainless districts—trade and periodical winds, 199—origin and nature of hurricanes, 200—law of storms, 201—optical meteorology, 202—phenomena of magnetism, 203—this study, ought to be universal, 204.

William, Prince of Orange, 391, 393.

Winds, trade and periodical, 199.

Women, outrages on, 235—distressing frequency of, 234—outrages of rich and poor, 235—seduction, betrayal, and desertion, 236—provocations of the poor, 237—disturbing and irritating influences, 238—"nagging," 239—what is the remedy? 240—penal enactments, 241—corporal punishment a questionable remedy, 243—Mr. Dillwyn's Bill, 243—"degradation" of whipping, 244—efficacy of flogging, how to be tested, 245—wife-beating, only symptomatic, 246—bad wives, 247—woman's influence in humble life, 248—some wives not helpmates, 250—training of girls, 251—"Mrs. Pardiggle," 252—homes of the poor, 253—their dwellings, 254-256.





